Tampere University

Roosa Eriksson

JUSTIFYING BASIC INCOME IN FINNISH AND SPANISH PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Faculty of Social Sciences
Master's thesis
December 2019

ABSTRACT

Eriksson, Roosa: Justifying Basic Income in Finnish and Spanish Parliamentary Debates
Master's thesis
Tampere University
Master's Degree Programme in Social Sciences
December 2019

Over the 2010s, unprecedented policy attention has been brought to universal basic income. The proposal of giving all members of a polity a periodic, unconditional and individual cash transfer has effectively shifted from the margins to concrete political debates in Europe. This raises new questions about how local policy-makers justify basic income in these debates, as public justifications have a role in shaping the perceived legitimacy of a policy proposal. Although there has been an expansion in basic income research, only a handful of studies have addressed this dimension.

The aim of the study was to examine how parliamentarians in two European countries, Finland and Spain, justify basic income. The case countries were selected on the bases that there has been a wide discussion on basic income in the recent decades in both countries, and basic income related pilot projects have recently taken place in both. The two countries also have a history of persistent long-term unemployment, which has been argued to possibly enhance interest in basic income.

The study addressed how the purpose of basic income is understood in Finnish and Spanish parliamentary debates and to what extent justifications shared similarities across case parliaments. The data consisted of plenary sitting documents (N = 104) from Finnish and Spanish parliaments that contained at least one mention of basic income over the periods of 2005–2007 and 2015–2017, (N = 89 documents from Finland, N = 15 from Spain). The case study approached basic income debates from the theoretical perspectives of domestication of global models and epistemic governance. Discourse analysis and the epistemic governance framework were utilized to organize findings. The goals in arguments for basic income were identified and linked to assumptions about the environment, actors, norms, and values they relate to.

The results presented the three most prevalent discourses according to the purpose of basic income. These were i) fixing the safety net, ii) encouraging activity, and iii) emancipation of popular classes. In the safety net discourse, the existent social benefits system was perceived to be a result of a mismatch of short-term reforms for fixing systemic problems and basic income, in contrast, was positioned as a cohesive reform. Work was understood as an increasingly insecure source of income, and old group categorizations of benefits receivers as no longer matching with the new situation. The activity discourse depicted humans as naturally striving towards activity and basic income as a means to enhance work participation. In the emancipation discourse, basic income was a means for increasing material independence, which was seen as a necessary precondition for fulfilling democratic rights. The safety net discourse was shared in basic income justifications across the case parliaments, the activation discourse was specific to Finnish justifications, and the emancipation discourse specific to Spanish justifications.

The activity discourse and the emancipation discourse depict very different ways of understanding the purpose and the scope of potential of basic income. Based on the analysis, there is a wide consensus among parliamentarians across the case parliaments on the need to streamline the social safety net and that working life has changed. The results illustrate the complexities of basic income and how it can be conceptualized and justified in various ways. To discuss politics of basic income and how the proposal is received in different countries, there is a need for future case studies that examine how basic income looks like within local discourses, and how these discourses connect with the institutional and political context in which they appear.

Keywords: basic income, comparative case studies, parliamentary debates, epistemic governance, Spain, Finland

The originality of this thesis has been checked using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction

Universal basic income, or basic income in short, has made its way to the newspaper headlines and to political agendas in the recent years. From Silicon Valley influencers to social movements and decision-makers from different parts of the world are expressing interest towards the proposal of granting all citizens or residents of a polity a periodical, unconditional cash transfer. Not just that – the last decades have also rapidly witnessed several basic income pilots being brought forward in India, Namibia, the Netherlands, Canada and Finland among others. In the recent years, international news followed the Swiss national referendum on universal basic income in 2013, the Finnish government's announcement of national experiment in 2015, and the start and later suspension of the Ontario experiment in 2018 (De Wispelaere, Halmetoja & Pulkka 2019, 390). Political parties in Europe – particularly the Greens and different parties on the Left, but also some liberal parties from the right –have expressed support for the proposal for decades (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017; Chrisp & Martinelli 2019). Although some of the recently proposed schemes bear little resemblance to the core dimensions of unconditionality, universality and individuality of a basic income, they nevertheless indicate that an unpresented number of individual actors and groups around the world are now keen to take part in the global discussion on basic income and its variants (see e.g. Chrisp 2017; Haagh 2019; Widerquist 2019).

Basic income has featured in discussions on a wide range of modern-day societal challenges. The proposal has been cited for example in discussions about labor market changes, automation, environmental issues and rethinking the limits of economic growth, and questions regarding just and equal citizenship (see e.g. Raventós 2007; Standing 2017; Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017). In Europe, discussions about basic income often evolve around the question of whether current benefits systems still prevent poverty and unemployment, while also enabling individuals' autonomy in a context of changing labor markets and diversifying forms of life (see Soininvaara 2000, 7). In the most recent spur of debates, basic income has been perceived as a tool for renewing benefits systems and to resist austerity politics adopted after the global financial crisis of 2008 (see De Wispelaere 2015, 29.) For some, the recent developments indicate that basic income is well on its way in moving from general proposal towards practice, while other scholars point out that there are political and institutional bottlenecks, which pose important obstacles for prospects of basic income moving up in political agendas (De Wispelaere & Noguera 2012; Noguera 2018; Haagh 2019).

Basic income can be justified from a variety of normative and practical perspectives and the proposal has been capable of attracting support broadly across the ideological spectrum (Perkiö 2013, 2; De Wispelaere 2015; Chrisp 2017). Simultaneously, basic income has also produced intense counter-reactions across the same political divides. It has also been argued that even the diverse supporters of basic income often share just a superficial agreement on the most abstract version of basic income, effectively hiding fundamental and persistent disagreements that exist between them (Crisp 2017; Casassas & De Wispelaere 2011, 125).

This case study aims to contribute to the literature by conducting a comparison of Finnish and Spanish parliamentary debates and justifications for basic income. In 2000s and after the economic crisis in 2010s, there have been lively discussions over basic income in both countries (Perkiö, Rincón & van Draanen 2019). Finland and Spain have also suffered from long-term unemployment, which has been seen as one possible driver of interest in universal basic income (Andersson 2000; Groot & van der Been 2000; Andersson & Kangas 2002; Sanzo González 2011). A growing attention has been drawn to universal basic income in both contexts, as several bills have been presented in both countries regarding basic income. In both Spain and Finland, the proposal has also been resisted by both individual parliamentarians and political parties (Clua-Losada 2011; Koistinen & Perkiö 2014). In this study, the terms basic income or basic income proposal will be used when referring to the general definition of basic income, and the term basic income scheme(s) when referred to the various practical basic income models. At its core, basic income is a universal, unconditional and individual cash transfer delivered periodically to the members of a polity. Although there is an ongoing debate about the specifics of each of these three basic dimensions, they set the common starting ground for any basic income debate. In practice, different characteristics of basic income can be translated into very differing basic income schemes.

Studies on basic income politics have addressed the distinct positions of political parties towards basic income (e.g.Van Parijs & Vanderboght 2017; Chrisp & Martinelli 2019) and the problems of political coalition building (De Wispelare 2016). Previous studies have pointed out how complex political power dynamics play into prospects of basic income and its variants in practice. At the same time, considerably less attention has been paid to how policy-makers justify basic income in practical policy debates. Basic income provides an appealing case for studying political field battles because at present there is unprecedented policy attention towards the proposal but, simultaneously, it has not been implemented in any country yet.

Until now, there is only a couple of studies in the field of discursive politics of basic income. These include Johanna Perkiö's (2019) research on framing of basic income in Finnish political documents from the 1980s to 2016, and Brian Steensland's (2008) work on the discursive struggle over North American guaranteed income scheme in the 1960s and 1970s political documents. Perkiö (2019) argues that discussions about the persistent political struggles around basic income cannot be understood thoroughly without knowing how the proposal has been presented in different national contexts. Appealing to some aspects of the proposal while obscuring other perspectives can have a considerable effect on how the public evaluate basic income's legitimacy (Pulkka 2018).

In local contexts, policy proposals are not met without contestation, and previous scholarship on adoption of global models suggest that local policymakers play an essential role in promoting proposals to make them seem fit for a given national context (Alasuutari 2015, 53). From a comparative perspective, this thesis aims to understand how local policymakers justify basic income. The study asks,

1) How do politicians in Finnish and Spanish parliaments justify basic income? To what extent do justifications for basic income share similarities across the case parliaments?

2) How is the purpose of basic income understood in these justifications?

Parliamentary debates give insight into the process of convincing other politicians about a policy. Looking at how politicians justify basic income in public arenas such as the parliament puts us in the middle of the process of making sense and 'taming' (Alasuutari & Qadir 2014b) the proposal to local conditions. Party-political power dynamics, such as who happens to be in the government to make decisions, of course do impact in practice on what bills are likely to be accepted, but among the reasons for considering a policy proposal is whether politicians are convinced that the proposal would be desirable, viable and feasible. Parliaments represent a forum in which this work of convincing other politicians and the public takes place.

Important parts of persuading other policy-makers happen of course hidden from the public eye, but parliamentary debates are important in another sense precisely because they are public. Media outlets and parliamentary debates on basic income are likely to be followed by those interested in basic income. Observations of these field battles are used in reports, articles, basic income anthologies and public discussions, which in turn produce comparative knowledge on

basic income and its prospects. Second, at least some of the general public are likely to listen to parliamentary debates or read news articles about these, and to that extend they also have repercussions on how the national public comes to understand basic income. Particularly in the case of policy proposals that are still quite unknown to the general public, such as basic income, these public justifications may play an important role in shaping people's associations related to the proposal (Perkiö, Rincón & van Draanen 2019).

The structure of the thesis is as follows. Chapter 2 introduces the main historical developments of global basic income discussions and discusses the variety of the dimensions and justifications of basic income in more detail. Chapter 3 concentrates on the comparative perspective adopted in the study and the developments of the basic income debate in Spanish and Finnish contexts. In the summary section of Chapter 3, similarities and particularities of the local discussions are drawn together. Chapter 4 outlines the theoretical perspectives of domestication and epistemic governance adopted in the study. The collection of the data and the process of organizing findings adopting Fairclough & Fairclough's (2012) framework for practical reasoning is described in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 presents the results of the closer analysis, organized into three subsections according to the three main discourses found, and the study is concluded in a discussion in Chapter 7.

2. Basic Income: A Proposal on the Move

In order to understand current-day global basic income debates, this section provides an outlook into where the discussion emerged in different parts of the world (section 2.1.) and how the basic definition of basic income leaves room for a wide variety of different basic income proposals and justifications (section 2.2.) As this case study concerns the current European context, the section 2.2. is not intended as a comprehensive account of all the context-dependent debates on basic income or of the historical roots of the proposal, but rather as a general upshot of the overall developments. Similarly, the section 2.3. is intended as a general upshot of the overarching practical and normative questions that are cited along with basic income in such a regular manner, that some of those are likely to appear in the parliamentary justifications.

2.1. From Separate Beginnings to a Global Debate

First proposals for some form of unconditional monetary grants to citizens have been traced to over 200 years ago in the US and Europe (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017). Social reformists such as Thomas Paine, Charles Fourier and Juan Luis Vives, striving to combat extreme poverty of their own time, have often been cited as loosely conceived predecessors of basic income thinking (Raventós 2007; De Wispelaere 2015, 26; Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017, 51-54). Some authors connect the 'prehistorical' roots more straightforwardly to the perceived waves of public discussion on basic income type proposals (Widerquist 2019), while others discuss the prehistory as a general conceptual background understanding which exists before the eventual contemporary emergence of the basic income proposal (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017). The narrative connection some made between Paine's pre-industrial thought and the current-day basic income discourse has also been questioned. Louise Haagh (2019, 256-259) for example argues that tracing the origins of basic income discussions back to Anglo-liberal economic development has given the basic income discourse often a self-proclaimed radical flavor and set itself for a task of correcting inequalities beyond the proposal's likely potential.

In any case, these early beginnings are still far away from contemporary basic income debates. The actual term basic income in its current sense as an individual, universal and unconditional benefit seems to have been first used in 1950s by a political economist George D. H. Cole, when he argued that an income should be distributed to every citizen in part as direct payments from the state (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017, 80). Cole and another Oxford economist, James Meade, made these individual pleas for a basic income or a "social dividend" among citizens, but not much was happening elsewhere in Europe yet in this period (ibid. 81). In the 1960s and 1970s, proposals with similarities to basic income were debated in the U.S. under different names: guaranteed income, minimum income grant and demogrant (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017, 87-91). In the U.S. in this period there was also a debate mobilized notably by Milton Friedman on a negative income tax[1], which in terms of retributive outcomes could be similar to those of a basic income grant (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017; Widerquist 2019, 36).

These discussions in the U.S. did not have important repercussions in Europe, apart from the negative income tax being studied in a governmental report in France (Widerquist 2019, 36). During the 1970s, several academics and individuals, apparently unaware of each other in

[1] a cash transfer scheme in which tax compensation is given to those falling under a certain threshold, as observed at the end of the taxation period.

Britain, the Netherlands and Denmark started appealing for a guaranteed income grant as an alternative to full employment through continuous economic growth. In 1977, Netherlands became the first country in the world in which a political party (a small left-wing party in this case) adopted basic income (basisinkomen) to its electoral program. In this regard, Netherlands was the only country at the time in Europe with party-politically relevant basic income debate (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017, 96-97).

Following the developments that happened in late 1970s, the emergence of contemporary basic income debates has been located to the late 1970s or early 1980s Europe and the U.S., with some country variation (De Wispelaere 2015; Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017; Haagh 2019; Widerquist 2019). In 1984, the first national network on basic income, Britain's Basic Income Research group, was formed, followed by the formation of the first cross-national network, Basic Income European Network, in 1986. The latter was a result of a gathering of a small group of academics and trade unionists of the Charles Fourier Collective, organized as a first international get-together of actors supporting basic income in Belgium (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017, 97-98). The formation of an international network facilitated exchange of knowledge and comparations on the developments of the debate in different countries. The network aims at connecting individuals and groups interested in the proposal (both in favor and against), it runs a regular newsletter and has organized international basic income congresses every two years and, in the most recent years, every year (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017, 97-98). One example of the increased interest in the proposal during the recent decades is that this international network (now renamed as Basic Income Earth Network) has rapidly doubled its national and regional basic income network affiliates, from 12 national affiliated networks in four continents in 2007 to 37 in five continents in 2019 (Raventós 2007, 17; BIEN 2019b).

Jurgen De Wispelaere (2015) divides the emergence of contemporary basic income debates into three waves: first one in the 1980s in the European and U.S. context and the second, in the late 1990s in the African and Latin-American contexts (De Wispelaere 2015, 28). The first wave emerged in the US as a criticism towards the 1980s changes in social security arrangements perceived to be shifting from welfare to workfare policies. It was argued that basic income could more efficiently fix gaps in the social security safety net and contribute to shifting the focus towards a broader understanding of work in the context of enhanced ecological and economic concerns. (De Wispelaere 2015, 28). The second wave appeared in the 1990s in African and Latin-American countries where basic income was discussed as a way to push fractioned welfare arrangements to consider wider groups of population that were not covered under existent

minimum income programs (ibid.). Over the 2000s there had been an enhanced global debate on basic income among academics and advocates, facilitated by the emergence of internet, the existing international network and the spread of the discussion to new actors and geographic areas (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017, 98). However, only the third wave of basic income debates awakened from 2013 onwards has been a distinctively global and public debate (De Wispelaere 2015, 28; Haagh 2019).

In 2013 the Swiss held a Citizen's Initiative, which lead to a national referendum on giving all citizens a €2800 monthly unconditional basic income. The result of the Swiss referendum was negative, but it raised public awareness and media coverage on basic income. A similar case was that of the European Citizen's Initiative for universal basic income for which signatures in 28 European countries were collected between 2012 and 2014, in the end failing to reach the minimum number of signatures to continue to the European Commission (De Wispelaere 2015, 29, 71.) In 2015, Finland's then newly elected government announced a national basic income experiment in its Government Program and attracted widespread international media attention. Closely thereafter more experiments were announced, by a coalition of municipalities in the Netherlands, the province of Ontario in Canada, four cities in Scotland backed up by the Scottish Assembly, an EU-funded pilot project in Barcelona-Besos area in Spain and a number of experiments by private organizations such as Give Directly (pilot in Kenya) and Ycombinator (USA). (De Wispelaere, Halmetoja & Pulkka 2019, 390.)

The most recent wave of basic income debates has been distinctively global due to the international media attention, widely published grassroots campaigns and the several pilot programs planned or rolled out recently (Widerquist 2019, 40-41; Haagh 2019, 258). If in the beginnings of the 1980s basic income mainly discussed among individual academics, politicians and activists, currently the range of actors voicing their view in favor of some form of basic income is ever wider and more diverse. The recent basic income pilots and experiments have shifted the debate to a moment in which the proposal is receiving widespread interest and support from influential actors and policy-makers than in any previous periods (De Wispelaere, Halmetoja & Pulkka 2019, 390.) To understand growing interest of actors across the political spectrum on basic income, the next section discusses the different dimensions and justifications of basic income.

2.2. One Name – Normative and Practical Differences

There are at least three ways of looking at basic income. Firstly, as the most general level proposal as in a universal, unconditional and individual cash transfer. Secondly, as a variety of more concrete proposals, in which the basic dimensions and additional ones are discussed and developed into a more detail, for example in academic literature or in political documents. Thirdly, on the basis of different dimensions of basic income it is possible to formulate a myriad of concrete, practical basic income schemes which can vary substantially from each other.

One of the most cited general definitions for basic is by the Basic Income Earth Network (BIEN 2019a): 'a periodic cash payment unconditionally delivered to all on an individual basis, without means-test or work requirement'. This means that basic income is received by everyone independent from other sources of income or the activities they engage in. Building from here, there are several often unvoiced, but generally assumed characteristics that a basic income scheme would have. It is argued that basic income should not be withdrawn from the recipient without due legal process and that it should be paid in cash rather than for example ear-marked vouchers. These cash transfers should be done in predictable, regular intervals. Basic income payments should continue throughout one's life cycle, although the amount could vary according to age for example by providing smaller amounts to young people and larger amounts to pensioners. (De Wispelaere 2015; Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017.) As with any policy proposal there are ongoing debates about these dimensions, but for the purpose of this study it can be concluded that the aforementioned characteristics are widely accepted among scholars.

These dimensions already lay out the overarching dimensions a basic income is generally expected to have. At the same time these do not say anything about many crucial dimensions that affect the proposal, such as the level of basic income, the ways of funding it and whether it would be built on top of existent benefits programs or whether it would replace some or most of them (see De Wispealere 2015). This largely explains the fact that there are basic income supporters and opponents across the ideological spectrum (Chrisp & Martinelli 2019). Indeed, there have been pleas for a basic income from replacing all other social benefits schemes and most public services (Murray 2008) to pursuing the highest possible basic income that is sustainable, complemented with free or heavily subsidized public services (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017, 104). As argued by De Wispelaere (2015, 73), more progressive or conservative proponents of basic income are likely to pitch different levels of basic income and respond differently to the question of what other programs basic income should replace.

Different understandings about these dimensions of basic income and the institutional environment may be coupled with a variety of different lines of justification for basic income by parliamentarians.

Like in the case of discussing any reform, concrete justifications for basic income would appeal to either the normative desirability, or to its practical feasibility, or both (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017). The aim of the study is not to justify for basic income, but since the practical and normative perspectives on basic income will emerge in the parliamentary debates, some general points are useful. Essentially, justifications of any reform entail diagnostics of the situation at hand and some goals to reach and, in this sense, they always necessarily involve a normative dimension. For example, it is often argued that basic income could affect issues related to poverty and inequality, unemployment, general wellbeing or individual freedom of choice (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017). The successfulness of these types of claims firstly depend on whether others can accept that these states of affairs such as poverty exist per se, and whether there the goals related to these could be accepted as desirable. Simon Birnbaum (2019, 508-509) notes that some general considerations in defense of basic income appeal to the values of humanity and utility, that is, reducing human suffering and improving individuals' overall wellbeing or happiness. In practice, these types of general goals boil down to complex practical issues to be tackled; there are always many possible measures to be taken, and the strong assumption of scarce allocable resources generally limits the range of options for actions deemed as possible. (Birnbaum 2019, 511.) As posed by Birnbaum (2019, 511), even if the overall objectives are accepted, there are still at least two questions which are left open for justification.

Firstly, there is a question of whether a basic income is needed, and secondly whether it would be fair. Justifications from the perspective of need would appeal to basic income's target-efficiency, namely that other measures would not be more effective or cost-efficient in achieving the goals, and without causing undesirable side-effects. (ibid.) There is a variety of different perspectives to the question of fairness and basic income, but one specifically strong principled question regarding fairness and normative desirability of basic income consistently appears in basic income debates. It concerns a particular group of potential beneficiaries, namely the question of able-bodied adults capable of working and whether they should be entitled to unconditional transfers (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017, 99; Birnbaum 2019, 512). This question is expressed across different social context in the form of 'work ethic' or the generally shared perception that individuals should contribute to the society sincerely according to their

capabilities in exchange for others doing so too (De Wispelaere & Noguera 2012, 28). This has also been called the norm of reciprocity, namely that people are willing to cooperate with others similarly disposed to them, but also to punish those actors that violate the generally accepted social norms (Bowles & Gintis 1998). Telling of the centrality of this issue is that the question of reciprocity and work ethic is addressed in most, if not all, academic texts that touch upon normative (un)desirability of basic income (see e.g. Standing 2017; Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017; Birnbaum 2019). Surveys and focus group discussions to measure the publics' perception of whether someone is 'deserving' of welfare provisions indicate that the value of work remains central (van Oorschot 2000; Laenen, Rossetti & van Oorschot 2019), and as basic income could challenge this, it is likely that justifications need to address this particularly common objection in some way.

3. Comparative Perspectives to Basic Income Debates

This chapter begins with explaining the comparative perspective adopted in the study, and research ethical considerations related to my own position as a writer. Thereafter, the selection of Finnish and Spanish parliaments as cases for analyzing parliamentary basic income justifications is discussed. The following sections 3.1. and 3.2. describe the general developments of basic income discussions in Spain and in Finland respectively, and the chapter is concluded with a short summary drawing together similar features of the basic income discussion across the two case countries.

As mentioned, basic income in contemporary policy-making has been presented as an answer to a wide array of current social and economic challenges. Many of these challenges, such as poverty, unemployment or automation, appear widely discussed from one national context to another even if they may be articulated as issues a nation-state is facing. It has been argued that much of social scientific research is bound to methodological nationalism which makes it hard to consider the interdependencies among nation-states and how these nation-states themselves have been shaped using international comparisons in policy-making (Kettunen 2008, 17; Alasuutari & Qadir 2016b). The challenge is to travel beyond the otherwise default "national gaze" through acknowledging these independencies (Kettunen 2008, 12, 94). The compared basic income justifications are connected both to local developments and to the transnational

basic income discussion. In this regard, the context of the basic income debate is perceived as local and transnational at the same time.

A comparative case study allows to analyze possible similarities in social and economic challenges discussed alongside with basic income, as well as the particularities of the two local contexts. Kettunen (2008, 19) argues that methodologically, a researcher should strive to examine one's own culture as "a familiar foreign country". This has two-fold implications for an analysis conducted. As a writer, I may have blind spots for capturing widely held assumptions in my own cultural context due to my own background understandings. On the other hand, as a foreigner to the Spanish context, regardless of the time spent learning and living in the country, there can be aspect that I am not able to capture in the analysis. Acknowledging my own placement in relation to the work conducted, I have strived to overcome some of the most obvious obstacles by very carefully studying the case countries institutional, political and sociocultural contexts.

Considering that this study is a comparative case study in the field of sociology, there is one particularly strong strand of cross-national comparative tradition in sociological and social policy research that deserves an additional notion here. This is the comparative orientation comparing different welfare state types, regimes or models, usually influenced by Esping-Andersen's (1990) analytical typology between liberal, conservative and social-democratic welfare regimes. This study is not concerned with explaining justifications for basic income through these distinctions, but the influence of this field of research in public and academic discussions has been so strong that implicit assumptions related to these typologies should be bared in mind. Separating nation-states or welfare states to units of analysis also enables ranking them in a hierarchy and giving them characteristics, such as 'forerunner', 'competitive' or 'emerging' in public discussions as well as in academic research (Leena Tervonen-Gonçalves 2013, 77-78). Academic literature and comparative studies are not, then, free from perceiving world's societies as a hierarchy, within which different nation-states strive to "advance" towards "better" nation-states along the lines of the ethos of modernization (Alasuutari 2015, 16). The challenge is to contribute to a cross-cultural understanding of social processes in a way that goes above and beyond a comparison between assumed "national blocs", which are often, unconsciously or not, placed in some hierarchical order. Aiming to understand how a specific policy issue is addressed in two different national parliamentary settings, the study is located as a case-oriented cross-cultural policy comparison (Tervonen-Gonçalves 2013, 60-62).

Finnish and Spanish parliamentary debates were selected for this case study first of all because these represent European countries in which there have been lively discussions on basic income during the last two decades (Perkiö, Rincón & van Draanen 2019). In these two countries, academics and policy-makers have played a central role in formulating proposals for basic income, compared to for example with Germany in which grassroot movements have been more important (Perkiö 2013). This makes them apt for studying particularly the parliamentary debates in which policy-makers have the stage. Secondly, these two countries represent cases in Europe in which long-term unemployment has prevailed both during the 2000s of economic prosperity and in the 2010s after the financial crisis (albeit much more severely in Spain). Basic income is very commonly cited along with issues related to work and unemployment, and it has been argued that basic income may have more support in contexts with high levels of unemployment (Andersson & Kangas 2002). Thirdly, the two also represent state-of-the-art in the recent years' developments in the basic income discussion in that in both countries there has been a basic income related pilot conducted in the 2010s (Perkiö, Rincón & van Draanen 2019). This would also indicate that in these countries there is, at least to some extent, some invested political interest in the proposal.

The purpose here is not to study the institutional fit of basic income in the case countries, but existing benefits systems, or at least actors' perceptions of them, form part of the background understandings in parliamentary debates on any potential benefits system reform. As outlined in Chapter 2, a basic income scheme, depending on its level and other specific features, could replace or top up a variety of existing benefits in a given polity. The most central cash benefits schemes in comparison with basic income are those that cover working-age population. The next two subsections 3.1. and 3.2. mention these existing minimum benefit schemes in the two case countries and describe general developments of basic income discussions in Spain and Finland.

3.1. Basic Income in the Spanish Context

Basic social assistance benefits to people in working age in Spain are composed of parallel systems of a state level system and regional social assistance. These include a temporary unemployment benefit at a low level and different regional minimum income schemes[2].

[2] Minimum income schemes overall in Europe are benefits that are intended as last resort support for those adults who are not entitled to social insurance payments. These benefits are considered normally on a household basis

(Noguera 2018; Sanzo González 2017). Spain is divided into seventeen autonomous communities and based on Spanish Constitution, governments of the autonomous communities can take legal and budgetary control over their social assistance schemes. The autonomous communities have generally used this right, and at present each region has their own minimum income scheme, with very varying levels of coverage and amount, eligibility criteria and the activation measures attached to them. (Noguera 2018, 2, 7.) In most regions, the minimum income benefit is limited in duration and therefore there is no ultimate last resort benefit which would offer economic security for Spanish working age population as whole (Sanzo González 2011, 292-293; Sanzo Gónzalez 2018.) Current schemes take the household into account whereas basic income would be individualized, and the distributive effect of proposed basic income schemes in Spain would mean that much more people would become net beneficiaries (Noguera 2018, 45).

Before the 2000s, universal basic income started to appear to the Spanish debates in several minor discussion fields. First appearances of basic income in the Spanish literature seem to date to 1991, when the Foundation for Marxist Investigations (Fundación de Investigaciones Marxistas) edited transcriptions of conferences in which the proposal, based on the proposition of Robert van der Veen and Philippe Van Parijs, had been debated in the Spanish context (Pérez 2015, 336). In 1993 the Green party of Castilla included a basic income inspired proposal into their electoral program. In 1996, a citizen's initiative was represented in the Bask regional parliament which included a recommendation for the recognition of a (non-universal) basic income as a citizen's right at the minimum for those outside of the labor market. An association for basic income (AREBA, Asociación Renta Básica) was created in 1996 and in 1998, the first gathering of basic income were held in Barcelona. (Pérez 2015, 336-337.)

A couple of years later in 2001, a national Basic Income Network (Red Renta Básica) was established to enhance investigation and general awareness of the proposal (Raventós, Wark & Casassas 2012, 136-137; Pérez 2015, 338-339). The participants in the first Symposium of the national Basic Income Network included academics, trade union representatives from the main unions, members of social movements and a few left-wing politicians from the eco-socialist Initiative for Catalonia Greens (Iniciativa per Catalunya-Verds), the social-democratic party The Republican Left of Catalonia (Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya) and The Spanish Socialist

and they include means-testing, which means that eligibility on whether the applicant has no other or insufficient means of financial support. These frequently also include strict conditionality rules on actions that the recipient must take to receive the benefit. (Frazer & Marlier 2016, 5-6, 15, 17-18.)

Workers' Party (Partido Socialista Obrero Español, PSOE). After the first Symposium held in Barcelona in 2001, the national Basic Income Network has organized new conferences on an annual basis. (Raventós, Wark & Casassas 2012, 137.) Over the period of 2002 to 2005 there were also five basic income schemes proposed by academics in Spain. Overall objectives of different schemes related to reducing stigma and poverty, rationalizing social benefits system and tackling issues of unemployment and precarity. (Perkiö 2013.)

Over the 2000s, several basic income bills were presented in Spanish autonomous communities and two in the Spanish national parliament. The first bill related to basic income was debated in 2002 in the Catalonian parliament. It set the reference point for the two following bills presented in the Spanish parliament in years 2005 and 2007. (Raventós, Wark & Casassas 2012, 137.) Both legislative bills presented in the national parliament proposed to introduce a basic income above poverty threshold in the Spanish territory. The bills of 2005 and 2007 were drafted in highly similar terms, and they were also very similar to the first bill presented in the Catalonian parliament in 2002 (Raventós, Wark & Casassas 2012, 137-140). The legislative bills of 2005 and 2007 in the Spanish national parliament were presented by the pro-independence Catalonian party The Republican Left of Catalonia (ERC) and the leftist-green coalition party United Left-Initiative for Catalonia Greens (Izquierda Unida-Iniciativa per Catalunya Verds, IU-ICV). The bills emphasized universal basic income as means to ending poverty, preventing stigmatization, increasing autonomy and freedom as well as rationalizing the minimum-income benefits system (ibid. 138). Although the bills were rejected, the parliamentary debates around the bills sparked considerable public interest and media coverage on basic income, and in 2007 resulted in establishing a subcommittee for studying the viability of a basic income at the state level in Spain (Raventós, Wark & Casassas 2012, 140-141).

During the years of the deepest economic crisis in Spain there was a double shift in basic income debates. It virtually disappeared from party politics while interest in the proposal arouse considerably within Spanish civil society movements. (Raventós, Wark & Casassas 2012.) Claims for basic income were sparked again due to large welfare budget cuts in public services and social investment policies, and due to new political actors to the party-political map in this time (Noguera 2018). Universal basic income re-gained considerable attention particularly though the Spanish 15-M movement and Podemos, which as a newly emerged Leftist party took universal basic income into their program for the 2014 European elections (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017, 192; Noguera 2018, 3).

Noguera (2018, 3-4) describes how Podemos's surprising success in votes and polls lead to the media and television to scrutinize the party's electoral program and the proposed basic income. This led to subsequent prime-time TV talk shows, in which basic income was overwhelmingly criticized as a utopian, populist and unfinanceable proposal for a state that had been close to a bankruptcy two years before. Although critical cuts in welfare spending under the crisis generated public interest in basic income, the proposal was also severely criticized as economically unfeasible and a barrier for reversing crucial cuts done in other fields such as health services, education, and elderly care. (Noguera 2018, 5-6.) For the following national elections, thereafter, Podemos gave two external economists the task of designing a more throughout benefit scheme, one minimum income guarantee and another one for basic income. The former scheme won, and they shifted from a basic income proposal to a conditional guaranteed income program as a more publicly defendable stepping stone towards basic income. (Pérez 2015; Noguera 2018, 3-4.)

In the Spanish context, particularly the Catalonian region has played a central role in advocating basic income in the political field. Implementing a universal basic income would necessarily entail a taxation reform but, since the autonomous communities do not hold sufficient autonomous fiscal capacity, they could not bring basic income into practice without the willingness of the national parliament (Clua-Losada 2011, 177). One of the most predominant justifications for basic income in the Spanish context has been that it would constitute an efficient means to combat social exclusion and poverty, caused by long-term unemployment (Clua-Losada 2011, 177). On the other hand, the basic income has been challenged as a threat to full employment and the right to work, which still are still highly held ideals also in leftist sectors (ibid.). Noguera (2018) notes that the discussion around basic income during the period of 2014-2016 produced more public interest towards income guarantee programs in general, pushing other Spanish national parties to present their own alternative proposals. Perhaps in part due to this, guaranteed income proposals with loosened behavioral conditions and means-testing than in the minimum income schemes are increasingly presented in the Spanish political agenda (ibid.).

Like other countries in which there has been vivid discussions around basic income, the proposal seems to come and go in waves of interest, appearing to the political agenda and then disappearing again after a couple of years, going back to a political anti-climax (Clua-Losada 2011, 182-183; Raventós, Wark & Casassas 2012; Noguera 2018). During the most recent years, there has been a regional guaranteed minimum income pilot project in the Catalonian area of

Barcelona-Besos, which has been linked to the basic income discussion (Perkiö, Rincón & van Draanen 2019). A recent analysis on Spanish newspapers described that news on basic income in 2017 were most often framed in relation to automation and the idea that artificial intelligence may be taking away jobs (Perkiö, Rincón & van Draanen 2019). Basic income justifications have also been influenced by philosophical reflections of freedom as lack of domination, emphasizing that democratic citizenship requires material independence (Raventós 2007; Raventós, Wark & Casassas 2012, 144).

3.2. Basic Income in the Finnish Context

In the Finnish context there are multiple social benefits for different target groups that a basic income could replace or top up. A basic income corresponding to minimum social benefits received by an unemployed person after taxes could be set to replace parts of unemployment benefits and basic social assistance, but it would also be higher than for example the current student allowance, the minimum level parental leave benefit or minimum level sickness allowance. In addition, it would make some new groups such as small entrepreneurs and freelance workers beneficiaries (Perkiö 2016, 13.) In Finland, working-age people that do not fill the working history requirements, or have already used maximum time of either the earnings-related unemployment benefit or the basic unemployment benefit, are left receiving labor-market subsidy which is unlimited in duration (Halmetoja, De Wispelaere & Pulkka 2018, 5). Labor market subsidy used to take account partner's income, but in 2003 this was first relaxed and in 2012 removed completely, making it an individual benefit. From 2014 onwards, a person receiving unemployment benefits can also top it up with earned income up to 300 euros per month, already easing the combination of the benefit and labor market activities. (ibid. 6.) Basic social assistance and housing benefits on the other hand are schemes which working-age population can apply for separately in addition to unemployment benefits (Halmetoja, De Wispelaere & Pulkka 2018, 10).

Basic income has been a regularly emerging proposal in Finnish discussions from late 1970s or early 1980s onwards (Ikkala 2012; Koistinen & Perkiö 2014). In party politics, the Green League (Vihreät) and Left Alliance (Vasemmistoliitto), and the Centre Party (Suomen Keskusta) have been in favor of basic income, although there have been individual supporters in almost all parties (Perkiö 2019, 3). The first proposed basic income scheme in Finland dates to 1984 and

there have been schemes proposed both by individual academics and societal thinkers and political parties from then onwards (Koistinen & Perkiö 2014).

In the context of 1980s unprecedentedly high unemployment under economic prosperity, basic income was discussed as way to tackle unemployment by increasing job sharing and alternatives to gainful employment, such as civil society work (Koistinen & Perkiö 2014). The discussion also evolved around guaranteed minimum income or citizen's wage as a social right, and as a means for enhancing redistribution and autonomy and reducing poverty (Julkunen 2009 268-269; Perkiö 2019). The term basic income seems to have first appeared in parliamentary debates in 1987, and it crowded out alternative terms in the 1990s context of deep recession. At this time, basic income discussion shifted to aims of incentivizing activity, facilitating partial employment and enhancing entrepreneurship, while also basic income proponents also questioned full employment as a central axis of the society (Perkiö 2019).

The very first years of the 2000s were very silent in Finland (Perkiö 2019). In 2006-2007, the precariat movement of EuroMayDay and The Green League's (Vihreät) basic income proposal in the elections of 2007 brought basic income back to public discussion and to the political agenda (Julkunen 2009; Ikkala 2012, 72-73; Perkiö 2019). The precarity movement of 2006 highlighted basic income as a means to tackle risks associated with "new work" or non-standard forms of employment (Julkunen 2009, 271; Perkiö 2019). Echoing widespread discussions on needs for systematic reform, the Finnish government in this time established the SATA Committee in 2007 with the aim of simplifying the social security to incentivize work, reduce poverty and to guarantee social security coverage in all life's situations. Due to internal conflicting views on the direction of the reform, the committee failed to deliver any substantial changes to the system. (Ikkala 2012, 75-76.) A national basic income network (Perustuloverkosto) was formed in 2011, and in 2013 a citizen's initiative campaign was held in Finland. Although the initiative failed to collect the necessary signatures to continue to the parliament, it was featured in the local media (De Wispelaere, Halmetoja & Perkiö 2019.)

Basic income reappeared to the Finnish parliamentary agenda and public attention big time in 2015, when the Finnish government then led by the Centre Party announced it was going to run a nation-wide basic income experiment. The aims of the experiment were strictly tied to labor market activation of unemployed people and in a broader sense to enhancing experimental culture in search for best practices (HE 215/2016 vp). Perkiö (2019) describes that basic income has been predominantly framed in terms of activity from mid-1990s onwards, but in recent years

the debate has concentrated even more narrowly in employment and active job-seeking instead of alternative forms of activity.

The Greens have been advocating for universal basic income ever since they were formed as a party in the 1980s (Koistinen & Perkiö 2014). According to Perkiö (2013, 224) especially members from a background in the National Coalition and the Centre Party, as well as many of the Green League, have denounced they do not support universal basic income which would liberate recipients from having to engage in gainful employment. Trade unions have also played a considerable role in Finnish politics and they, as well as the Finnish Social Democratic Party (Suomen Sosiaalidemokraattinen Puolue), have formerly rejected various basic income schemes as unrealistic or as promoters of neoliberal politics (see Koistinen & Perkiö 2014, 43-49). Like in the Spanish leftist sector, the Finnish social democrats have been against basic income due to commitment to full employment and social benefits based on work (ibid. 38). High supports for generous social protection have been reported among Finns, but unconditionality seems to be the most contested feature of basic income, as it collides with the strong work ethic and fears that basic income could lessen work motivation (Andersson & Kangas 2002; Julkunen 2009; Ikkala 2012, 78; Koistinen & Perkiö 2014, 39). At the same time, while in most European countries mostly minoritarian parties have supported basic income, in Finland also a major centrist party has been in favor of the proposal.

Johanna Perkiö's (2019) work on basic income framing among Finnish parties and politicians come closest to the focus of this thesis. In her study, Perkiö finds that the framing of basic income has changed from the 1980s, rights-based framing to a predominantly activation-based framing from 1990s onwards. She concludes that Finnish politicians have shared a wide consensus over the purpose of basic income both over time as well as party lines. She also suggests that the ability of basic income proponents in Finland to adapt to changing political climates may be among why the basic income proposal has lived so long in Finland (ibid.).

3.3. Summary of Basic Income Discussions in the Case Countries

Based on a review of the general developments in basic income discussion, some overarching similarities can be observed across the case countries. In both countries, peaks in basic income related discussions have emerged both in times of recessions and economic growth. This is the case for the 1980s and 1990s discussions in Finland, and for 2000s and 2010s in both countries.

Another aspect concerns the actors who have been active in the basic income discussion. In both countries there have been groups of individual academics, advocates and policy-makers who have participated in promoting basic income and creating basic income schemes fit to the national or regional context. Echoing global tendencies, major socialist or social-democratic parties in Spain (PSOE) and in Finland (SDP) have been against basic income due to links to the labor movement and centrality of work for their politics (Van Parijs & Vanderborght 2017, 189). Local green movement parties in the two countries have been in favor of basic income. This also is consistent with the overall image that the global green movement has consistently expressed sympathies for basic income, particularly from the perspective of ecological constrains for growth and the idea of nature and resources as shared property of humans (ibid. 197-201). In Finnish politics, also a big centrist party has favored basic income.

In both contexts, basic income debates have evolved around issues related to work, poverty prevention, autonomy and rationalization of the social benefits system. Basic income has been discussed in relation to challenges of long-term unemployment in both. In a recent analysis of newspaper articles in Finnish, Spanish and Canadian press in 2017, basic income is very strongly related to automation and job losses caused by technological advancement, poverty reduction and systematic changes needed in the social security system in both Spain and Finland (Perkiö, Rincón & van Draanen 2019). This can partly relate to the perceived problem of long-term unemployment which has prevailed in these countries both in times of economic prosperity and recession (see Sanzo González 2011, 290; Koistinen & Perkiö 2014). It appears that Spanish discussions on basic income have highlighted somewhat more poverty and precarious work, whereas Finnish discussions from late 1990s onwards have highlighted activity and lately labor market activation in a narrower sense.

Finally, the differences in the landscape of existing basic social benefit schemes in Spain and Finland serve as background understanding for the parliamentary debates on basic income. In both countries, there have been longstanding appeals for streamlining the social benefits system. In Spain, social assistance for those in working age is divided to a two-tire system between the state and the autonomous regions, resulting in fragmentation of the features of regional benefits, their coverage and duration (Noguera 2018; Sanzo González 2018). This could strengthen justifications for integrating and rationalizing the benefits system at the State level. The existence of a labor market subsidy of unlimited duration (and which from 2014 already allows recipients to combine it with additional earned income) in Finland, on the other hand, could limit the extent to which basic income can be justified as delivering systematic improvements to the

current state of affairs, but on the other hand the existent system is already more in line with a modest level basic income.

4. Theoretical Framework of the Study

As discussed in the previous sections, basic income as a policy proposal has had advocates from distinct corners of Europe and the world, and during the last decades it has moved towards concrete parliamentary debates in a previously unwitnessed manner. The perspectives of domestication and epistemic governance provide theoretical tools to get into grasps with this emerging shift from a globally discussed proposal to practical field battles in national parliaments over basic income and its purpose. This section discusses the theoretical perspectives adopted for the study.

Chapter 1 set out that that the empirical part of this study examines how parliamentarians persuade others about basic income and, in doing so, build certain ways for understanding basic income and the situation in hand. Consequently, first central point regarding the theoretical starting points is that the study adopts social constructivist perception on knowledge. Although there are differences among different strands of social constructivism, the common feature is that social constructivist perspectives question the evident nature of knowledge. Instead, knowledge is understood as something that is created in dynamic processes of meaning-making and is historically contingent. The knowledge produced has consequences for social action, as different constructions support some forms of action rather than others. (Burr 2003, 2–5.) This means that when parliamentarians make statements about the current state of affairs and how a basic income would play into it, these statements are analyzed perceptions that construct particular social realities and exclude other possible ones.

Chapter 3 already hinted at this direction discussing the perspective according which tendencies in national decision-making are largely understood as interdependent, rather than taking largely separate, sovereign welfare state 'containers' as a starting point. Alasuutari (2016, 4), suggests that modern governance is based on a belief that human societies constantly strive for better, more affluent or more efficient model of social organization, led by best practices and scientific development. Alasuutari (2016, 6) makes the claim that national interest, that which is justified as best for 'us' and our competitiveness, is not only the obvious starting point in all countries' political discourse but also the "only morally impeccable one" (ibid.) National policy-makers

routinely draw on international comparisons and international organizations' recommendations (see Meyer et al. 1997; for case studies see e.g. Alasuutari & Rasimus 2009; Tervonen- Gonçalves 2012; Rautalin 2018) to gain legitimacy for their proposals, and at the same time, national field battles also shape policy proposals, such as basic income, and change global perceptions on the proposal and its variants. Local policy-makers play an active role in promoting and 'packaging' policy proposals in ways which enable people to start viewing them as familiar, domestic and particularly designed for the local context (Alasuutari & Qadir 2014b, 9).

Domestication refers to this process of transformation in which actors seek to "tame" for example a new policy proposal, such as basic income, to the local context in a way that it its global roots become eventually faded away (ibid.). Alasuutari (2016, 4) argues that this dynamic means that actors across the globe react to new policy proposals or catchwords in an increasingly synchronized manner, like a 'flock of fish', although this does not mean the same as increasing convergence among the policy models adopted. The concept of domestication refers to the overall taming process, but it does not yet offer tools for analyzing how it happens in practice. For this purpose, Alasuutari and Qadir (2014; 2016) offer what they call the epistemic governance framework.

In their perspective on knowledge and governance, the authors draw on Foucauldian governmentality studies, developed by authors such as Peter Miller, Nicholas Rose and Mitchell Dean. Indeed, when Dean (1998, 91) talks about 'governing work' as in how governing is done using different techniques, rationalities and forms of knowledge to accomplish "the enfolding of authority", Alasuutari and Qadir use the term epistemic work. By this they (Alasuutari & Qadir 2014a; 2016) refer that policy-makers engage in the active work of persuasion in which justifications appeal commonly held assumptions about the social world, people's beliefs, hopes and desires. Epistemic governance thus concentrates on the layer of actors' conceptions of facts and themselves, as the threat of military violence or economic intervention are also a means for influencing people's conceptions to push them towards certain actions (Alasuutari & Qadir 2014a, 71).

The persuasion work is based on what the policy-makers themselves believe to be convincing to others. In other words, it is premised on their own assumptions about the social world, other actors and what is likely to work or not in order to influence others' reactions and future actions as desired. These shared, epistemic assumptions do not only contain knowledge of the values and principles which are regarded as virtuous and honorable, but also knowledge of what political arguments would be considered inadequate or a strategically unsuccessful in a debate.

(Alasuutari 2014, 28.) This take on strategic political persuasion is, of course, far away from being unique to Alasuutari & Qadir's framework, but their take on this epistemic work is that is often not strategic but unconscious – policy-makers end up also convincing themselves in the process as well (Alasuutari & Qadir 2014a). This would help explaining why, if not just because they are superficial 'hypocrits' (Meyer 2004) at some point in the domestication process politicians themselves become convinced that the policy proposals were result of unique national deliberation and suitable for tackling local issues.

Alasuutari and Qadir (2014a) suggest that epistemic governance always works around three mutually entangled objects of the social world: the ontology of the environment, actors and their identifications, and values, norms and moral ideals (Alasuutari & Qadir 2014a). They also suggest a division into a paradigmatic dimension and a practical dimension in each of these three objects. According to their description, assumptions in the practical dimension are more likely to be contested in practical debates, while paradigmatic assumptions often remain uncontested, tacit and taken for granted (Alasuutari & Qadir 2014a, 72-74). They argue that arguments normally draw on both dimensions: for example by drawing on a tacit Darwinian idea of naturally evolving societies always on their way towards progress, and scientific knowledge and facts to back up how a certain policy would place the country among 'leaders' of modernization process (ibid.) In distinguishing between these different dimensions of assumptions, the epistemic governance perspective is similar to other approaches under what has been called discursive institutionalism (Schmidt 2011). The difference is that they adopt the term epistemic assumptions while other authors often to talk ideas, and instead of talking about different levels of ideas, they talk about dimensions of epistemic assumptions. They also do not make the distinction between cognitive and normative assumptions or elite or public assumptions, like for example Vivien Schmidt (2011) or John Campbell (1998). This, coupled with the notion that Alasuutari and Qadir suggest policy-makers appeal to widely held assumptions in the society, indicate that parliamentary justifications in their view open a window to wider public assumptions as well.

The Table 1 below has been formulated for the purpose of this study. It illustrates the three objects (environment, actors and values and norms) on the two dimensions (paradigmatic and practical dimension) of epistemic work, through empirical examples provided in the text by Alasuutari & Qadir (2014a):

Table 1. Objects of epistemic work based on examples provided in Alasuutari & Qadir (2014a)

Objects of epistemic work			
	Ontology of the environment	**Actors and identifications**	**Values and norms**
Paradigmatic dimension	Society as a modernization project, "evolving" through naturalized development	Conceptions of human agency: e.g. humans as rational, self-interested homo economicus.	Morality based on natural rights
Practical dimension	"evidence-based policies", use of facts and measurements	Appealing to shared group interests: e.g. the nation as "us"	"sustainability", "human development", "child-centeredness"

The distinction to the three objects of the social world will be adopted for organizing the findings of the study. The overall notion of the existence of both more implicit, deep-seated assumptions and more vocalized, forefront concepts and catchwords guide the analysis towards to pay attention also to what is unquestioned and taken for granted (Schmidt 2010, 7; Alasuutari & Qadir 2014a, 77). The analysis in this study will abstain from making an explicit distinction in the suggested practical and paradigmatic dimensions. For one, it is not necessarily needed for being able to interpret the results, and second, as Vivien Schmidt (2010, 7-8) notes, the same concepts can be used to convey different things at different dimensions (or levels) of assumptions. The advantage of utilizing the epistemic governance framework in this study, instead of some other form of discursive institutionalist approach, is that it connects the persuasion work with the perspective of domestication.

5. Data and Methods

The following three subsections explain what kind of data parliamentary debates and plenary session transcripts are (section 5.1.). The following section 5.2. describes how the documents were collected, what was looked for in them and which documents were eventually taken into closer analysis (section 5.2.). Finally, section 5.3. discusses discourse analysis and how Fairclough

& Fairclough's (2012) framework for practical reasoning and the objects of epistemic work were utilized in the analysis and to organize the results.

5.1. Parliamentary Debates as Data

Saari ja Kananen (2009, 22) argue that traditionally, social policy research has taken political agendas as given consequences of the interplay between different interests and institutions. However, studies on domestic debates over new legislation suggest that these national policy debates are rarely about realizing a narrowly understood policy proposal in accordance to certain policy interests or functional needs of pre-existing institutions. Instead, these debates are more about a problem or a new 'exogenous' item brought to the national political agenda (Alasuutari 2013, 29.) As argued in Introduction, studying parliamentary debates on basic income sheds light into how local policy-makers come to understand basic income in the process of rationalizing it. It is argued that politicians justify their proposals as necessary for securing the nation's interests, which are not adequately met which existent measures, simultaneously downplaying narrow individual or group interests (Alasuutari 2015, 88). Pertti Alasuutari (2014, 28) goes as far as arguing that parliaments are the most important public forums of decision-making in modern societies, and therefore parliamentary justifications tell us what is considered correct or morally acceptable. However, there is no particular need for assuming a priori that parliamentary justifications would reflect wider society's assumptions at large, but politicians' shape how a certain policy becomes understood and contextualized. Parliaments represent a forum in which concrete decisions on the future are made, and parliamentarians' speeches are followed by the media and at least parts of the wider public, which makes them a compelling subject to study.

Parliaments can be understood as an institutional forum which sets certain expectations towards the communication that takes place in plenary sittings (see Schmidt 2011, 119). When parliamentarians enact speeches, criticize the government or pose questions in a plenary session, they engage in the global acts of legislating and governing a country (van Dijk 2004, 356). Regardless of the country in case, parliamentarians in plenary sittings engage in these global actions such as representing their constituents, engaging in opposition, or implementing party programs (van Dijk 2004, 356). The codes of conduct in parliamentary talk strike as similar around the world, as well. Parliamentarians assume a similar polite and formal ways of talking even when they often disagree on proper policies as they represent different parties, ideologies

and social groups (Alasuutari 2016, 87). Parliamentary speeches are also generally prepared beforehand, and the speakers know that they are being recorded and documented in public plenary session diaries, which are accessible for the wider public. Because of this work of preparation and because parliamentarians acknowledge the public nature of their speeches, they can be understood as strategic and testimonial. However, there are also more spontaneous comments made in plenary sessions, from interruptive shout-outs to comments thought out during the time it takes for the Chairperson to give a parliamentarian their turn to talk.

Chapter 2 already touched upon the argument that appeals for basic income happen in specific sociocultural and institutional contexts. These constitute part of the background assumptions against which arguments are made. In the context of this study, institutional settings are not viewed as 'objective' incentive structure for actors but rather as the meaning context in which justifications appear reasonable (Schmidt 2011, 119). To be able to interpret the results of this study, it is necessary to have at least an overarching idea of the cultural and institutional landscape of the case countries, because local parliamentarians are likely to assume that their audience is already familiar with many aspects of it. For one, parliamentarians may explicitly utilize certain aspects of these to make their case. But more importantly, they may assume some aspects of the existent system are so obvious that these are not spelled out (Alasuutari & Qadir 2016). Although the local politicians may be confident in that their intended audiences may understand what is left unsaid, the researcher should have enough background information in order to interpret these silences correctly in relation to the sociocultural and institutional contexts in which they appear.

5.2. Collection and Description of the Data

The Introduction outlined that this study will be asking first, how politicians in Finnish and Spanish parliaments justify basic income and to what extent these justifications bare similarities and second, how is the purpose of basic income understood in these debates. Publicly available plenary sitting transcriptions of the Finnish Parliament (Eduskunta, riksdagen) and the Spanish Congress of Deputies (Congreso de los Diputados) were used as data for this purpose. The Finnish parliament is a unicameral parliament of 200 Members of Parliament and the Spanish parliament is a bicameral parliament consisting of the Congress of Deputies (350 members) and the Senate. In the case of the Spanish parliament, the Congress of Deputies corresponds to the Finnish Parliament and was used as the site for collecting the data.

First, all of the plenary sittings of Spain and Finland in which basic income was mentioned at least once were collected from January 2004 to the end of December 2017 – the present moment at the time. The time window was chosen based on previous literature (Raventós 2012; Koistinen & Perkiö 2014; De Wispelaere 2015) which suggested that basic income discussions were actively debated in the political sphere in these two countries roughly from 2005 onwards, and again after the financial crisis of 2008 especially from 2013 onwards. Other wordings for basic income, such as citizen's wage (kansalaispalkka), citizen's income (kansalaistulo, renta básica de ciudadanía) and unconditional basic income (vastikkeeton perustulo, renta básica incondicional), were also looked for in the collection process. In the Spanish context, universal basic income was often referred to as unconditional basic income or citizen's basic income (renta básica incondicional, renta básica de ciudadanía), whereas in Finland the term basic income (perustulo) was the most common term to capture the intended concept.

In the process of recollecting all plenary sitting documents from 2004 to 2017, all mentions of basic income were revised and all those that did not refer to universal basic income schemes but something different were excluded from the data for subsequent analysis. These removed mentions included general notions that people should have some basic level income floor or mentions containing the term basic income but which in fact referred to other benefit programs. In Spanish debates, the term basic income (renta básica) was also used when referred to different autonomous communities' minimum income programs and other benefits programs in place, such as regional minimum income insertion schemes (rentas mínimas de inserción), basic income for emancipation (renta básica de emancipación) and guaranteed citizen's income (renta garantizada de ciudadanía). In some autonomous communities, such as Navarra and Andalucía, basic income (renta básica) is the name used of targeted minimum-income programs. In the Finnish documents, the term perustulo meant most of the time universal basic income, although there were some occasions in which the term was used to refer broadly to minimum income floor or minimum-income schemes in general.

After this, two periods in which there was a larger amount of basic income mentions in Finnish and Spanish national parliaments were scouted out from the data selection. Based on the amount of mentions, the data set was further concentrated to the peak periods of 2005–2007 and 2015–2017. The only exceptional year within this data set is 2015, when there was a strong peak in the discussion in Finland but no mentions of basic income at all in Spain. After careful consideration, this year was decided to be kept within the data set. The year 2015 was a key in the Finnish parliamentary debate, as the politicians at the time were discussing the national basic

income experiment. On the other hand, this made it possible to see whether the parliamentary debate sparked in Finland in 2015 had repercussions in the following years' basic income mentions by their Spanish colleagues.

The total number of plenary sitting documents containing at least one mention of basic income over the selected years and included for the closer analysis was N = 104. The average length of the plenary sitting records was 84 pages, the shortest document being 10 pages and the longest 215 pages. In majority of these documents, however, basic income was only mentioned in one or a couple more individual statements. In 37 plenary session records, which comprises roughly one third of the data, basic income was mentioned only once. These debates ranged from general social spending and budget debates to student fees and allowances, disability pensions, unemployment benefits, housing allowances; discussions around the aging population and the future of automation, critiques of austerity measures taken under the financial crisis and so on. Overwhelmingly, these mentions appeared in debates touching upon social policy, employment policies, and the future tendencies of work, public spending and future demographic tendencies.

The most mentions were made in those sittings in which bills on basic income were debated: October 2nd, 2007 in Spain (71 mentions) and October 25th, 2016 in Finland (246 mentions). These three proposals were also read through in order to understand the context of these debates, namely two bills for instituting a committee to research basic income in Spain (ES_14.4.2005 and ES_20.5.2005) and the Finnish government's bill for basic income experiment (HE 215/2016 vp). In these sessions, also negative postures towards basic income were clearly voiced and this largely explains the rise in amount of mentions during the period.

Table 2. Number of plenary sitting documents containing one or more mentions of basic income by country and year

	Finland		Spain	
	Number of documents	Number of mentions	Number of documents	Number of mentions
2005	7	22	5	26
2006	7	13	2	2
2007	6	24	1	71
----	----	----	----	----
2015	22	149	0	0
2016	30	551	2	2
2017	17	78	5	24
Total	89	837	15	125

Table 2 shows that during the observed years, basic income was mentioned in a total of 89 plenary sittings, while in Spain it was brought up in 15 plenary sittings. Basic income is mentioned in almost six times more plenary sessions in Finland and the large difference between the countries appear particularly in the period of 2015 to 2017. The growth in mentions in this latter period in Finland is explained by the announcement and debates regarding the Finnish basic income experiment from 2015 onwards. Basic income was intensively mentioned during the years 2015 and 2016, when the parliament discussed the legislative bill, the design and goals of the experiment. The following subsection will address discourse analytical perspectives, Fairclough & Fairclough's (2012) framework for practical reasoning and how it was used together with the epistemic governance perspective in the process of coding the data and organizing the results.

5.3. Discourse Analysis

Language is central to this process of meaning-making and it shapes the ways in which the social world becomes understandable to humans (Burr 2003, 8). Discourse analytical approaches strive

to search systems of meaning which are hidden in communication and interaction and often taken as granted (Remes 2006, 296). From a discourse analytical perspective, language is not taken simply as a device used to merely describe reality. Instead, it is argued that language and discourses play an active role in constituting, challenging and reshaping realities. Instead of a clear-cut research method, discourse analysis can be better described as a relatively flexible theoretical framework, in which it is possible to distinguish different orientations which vary in their philosophy of science (Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen 1993, 17). In this sense, it is more helpful to understand discourse analysis as quite broad family of more particular approaches rather than any singular approach.

While there are considerable differences between different discourse analytical approaches, they share the understanding of language and culture as systems within which actors create meanings. Discourse theoretical approaches, then, are interested in how language and culture shape and (re)produce social world. It is also assumed that multiple parallel and competing systems of meaning exist at the same time (Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen 1993, 17-18). This means that even in a one speech (as an example) there are typically elements from different discourses present. Discourses also limit understandings of social phenomena, actors and objects, as they depict particular images of the social world, while excluding others (Remes 2006, 332-333). This is not to say that matter would not exist independent from the understandings that humans construct about them, but as Torfing (2005, 18) puts it, "matter does not carry the means of its own representation". It is this layer of meanings and representations that discourse analytical approaches are interested in.

Fairclough & Fairclough's (2012) discourse analytical framework for practical reasoning was adopted for the analysis to scout out goals to which basic income was linked to in parliamentarians' arguments. The authors suggest making an analytical division in arguments between claims (what ought to be done), circumstances (the natural, social and institutional context of action), means and goals (future, possible state of affairs). Fairclough and Fairclough (2012, 44) suggest a structure of practical reasoning in which

> "the hypothesis [is] that action A might enable the agent to reach his goals (G), starting from his circumstances (C), and in accordance with certain values (V), leads to the presumptive claim that he ought to do A. "

Fairclough and Fairclough (2012, 44) continue saying that often in practice the context of action is perceived as a problem, to which the action is seen as a solution for. As an example, the argument that "basic income would reduce poverty" entails that if basic income was

implemented (action), it would help tackling poverty (a goal informed by values). The empirical work with the texts started with importing all documents to the Atlas.ti program. All claims related to basic income were marked, initially both the positive and the negative ones. In case the speaker was referring to previous statements in the sessions, those were also marked as the context in which basic income was brought in. The reading led towards concentrating more on basic income proponents for the simple reason that they spoke more about it. Those favoring basic income had to work harder to convince others as they were bearing the "burden of proof" against the backdrop of existent social benefits schemes and more conventional measures to renovate the system. There seemed to be more analytical unity in arguments in favor of basic income, while opposing arguments were often simply stating that basic income is utopian, would be impossible to finance or that it would have perverse consequences particularly for the valorization of gainful employment.

After marking the basic income related claims, these were printed out of the Atlas.ti -program. The claims were read alongside with the plenary sitting transcriptions of each corresponding claim to keep in mind the conversational context of these. Specific goals linked to basic income were looked for in the text and themes related to the goals, such as poverty, inclusion, unemployment, administration, broadening the concept of work were identified in the process. The aim of the process was to move inductively from specific goals towards unifying overarching goals (the purpose) of basic income. This in mind, attention was paid also to the objects of epistemic work in the process, asking to what kinds of understandings about values, social environment and actors these goals were related to in discourse. The analysis was aimed at scouting out the similarities between in basic income justifications between the two national parliaments. However, in the process of the analysis it became clear that there was a distinct predominant discourse in favor of basic income in the two parliaments. The final results were narrowed to three discourses in favor of basic income, one shared between the case countries and two that pro-basic income discourses particular to either Spain or Finland.

6. Results

The research questions for the case study concerned how basic income is justified in the two parliaments and how the purpose of basic income is understood in these debates. The results in the following subsections discuss the found basic income discourses: fixing the safety net (section 6.1.), enhancing activity (section 6.2.) and emancipation (section 6.3.). Each subsection

discusses how these were connected to particular understandings about the environment, actors, values and norms. These do not represent all basic income discourses found in the data but only the three most central ones.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, in the Spanish parliament there were two basic income bills presented, one in 2005 and one in 2007. The two legislative bills and the two proposals for starting a basic income committee are remarkably similar and even share identical parts. Both proposals highlight poverty, precarity of work and situations of family dependency as the main problems to tackle with introducing a basic income. They also argue strongly for the need to broaden the conception of 'work' from gainful employment towards recognizing the social value of care work and voluntary work (ES_14.4.2005; ES_20.5.2005). Between 2005 and 2007, basic income was maintained in the plenary sessions through individual mentions by members of the advocating parties. The second time after 2005 when a larger debate takes place in Spain is in 2007, when the two proposals for establishing a committee for studying basic income's viability is discussed in the parliament (ES_2.10.2007). National poverty rates and situations of family dependency remain focal points of the debate, which is strongly divided into those advocating basic income and those opposing it. The opponents point towards the impossibility of financing basic income and oppose the idea of giving a 'free pay' for everyone regardless of their work contribution, other sources of income or their life situation.

In the same period of 2005-2007 in the Finnish parliament, basic income was discussed as a way to tackle unemployment and perceived problems related to non-standard forms of employment, but also to extend social security for groups such as freelancers, small entrepreneurs, and students. The question of work precarity featured in the discussion as well. The Greens had included basic income to their electoral program of 2007. This provoked discussion around basic income also from those opposing the proposal, and the Greens were criticized in the plenary session for populist politics as basic income did not make it to the program of the Government in which Greens were part of.

In the latter period of 2015-2017, basic income was mentioned in the Spanish parliament related to Podemos' 2014 Euro election proposal. Podemos party members themselves were remarkably quiet about basic income as such in the national parliament, although they suggested gradual improvements to the existent minimum income scheme (which, particularly by those opposing their standpoints was connected to Podemos' previous basic income agenda). Basic income was also mentioned arguing that Finland was already on the way to implement the proposal, pointing to the Finnish basic income experiment.

In this time, Finnish debate on basic income was narrowed more down to whether basic income could improve work incentives and unemployment, rather than other forms of activity. Finnish discussions evolved around the technical and legal aspects of the planned national basic income experiment, as well as the positive international attention it was already attracting. Importantly for this analysis, these debates also involved struggles over the purpose of basic income. Particularly some Left Alliance and Green League members challenged the purpose of basic income understood narrowly as a measure for labor market activation. However, there was a wide consensus among the parliamentarians that basic income would constitute a positive way of activating citizens compared to strict activation measures.

In one third of the plenary sessions, basic income was mentioned once in the overall day's discussion. In these instances, it was brought up in anecdotally in debates on other policy proposals and it was almost exclusively done in a positive tone, as to remind other politicians that basic income could be an alternative way of addressing the case at hand. These mentions can be read as a strategic for mainstreaming the basic income proposal. The individual mentions were brought up in a way that did not tend to sidetrack the overall agenda of the day and with few exceptions and were also left without contestation.

In the next sections, the three main discourses found in the debates are described in more detail. The citations are selected as representing typical or illustrative examples of each discourse. Basic income was discussed in the plenary sessions related to perceived problems with of the existent social security system, changes in the labor market, and citizens' needs and rights. All justifications were done in relation to these broader understandings, whether basic income was discussed more as a pragmatic tweak to the existent system or as an ambitious or more radical program for change. In the end of the analysis there will be a summary of the main commonalities and differences between the basic income discourse in Finland and Spain.

6.1. Fixing the Safety Net

When basic income is justified by pointing out systematic failures of the safety net and how basic income would address them better, it is done against the unquestioned assumption that welfare states hold a normative responsibility towards citizen's basic needs and subsistence. This assumption is no different from those stressing any other social security reform, as addressing poverty and social exclusion, to increase income security and stability are widely perceived as

preconditions for a functional society and market. Against this background, basic income is justified as a holistic reform for problems arising from the system per se, and current changes in larger transnational environment, on the other.

Appealing to groups of potential basic income beneficiaries within the safety net discourse is typically done by highlighting the stress and suffering the existent system causes to those who need to navigate the complex system of benefits. Justifications also highlight that situations of economic distress are not people's own fault but caused by factors that are out of their control and evoke images of certain groups of people who are deemed as in particularly in need for cash transfers. These are intimately related in discourse and will be discussed along the analysis. These assumptions are also closely entwined to the activity discourse and the emancipation discourse. Tackling safety net issues and particularly how they are perceived to influence particular groups, however, is the baseline of basic income justifications in the overall data. As such, this section serves as a a primer for the next two subsections.

In both Finnish and Spanish context, basic income is justified as a measure which would contribute to fixing failures of the existent social assistance systems. The safety net appears in this discourse as a deep-seated metaphor. Images of the safety net (whether it is a messy patchwork of benefit programs or a coherent net without apparent holes) essentially serve to assess how well the nation is performing in terms of providing coverage against poverty and social exclusion, deemed as important risks to be remedied. The common rationale appealed to is the need for a systemic, rather than set of smaller partial reforms, which basic income, it is argued, could bring about. Finnish and Spanish alike appeal to the understanding that failures in the existent system have been recognized by policy-makers during past times, but these policies have only served as incomplete quick-fixes:

> The measures you have taken […] are nothing but patches that ask for lots of requirements and their duration is short-term. They are patches which only function to stigmatize poverty. […]. Just a while ago we presented an initiative to push forward a minimum income guarantee as the first step towards a basic income. Our group understands that this is one of the most central problems of our country […] (ES_28.9.2017)

> At some point we must remake a synthesis of our social security system, because this kind of patching up has truly created a situation in which it is possible to fall through the basic security net to the cold asphalt. Now that we discuss this basic income security experiment and basic income thinking, […] one [of the aims] is to patch up the social security system. (FI_10.3.2005)

The idea of the social security system as a mismatched combination of past policies implement to solve problems "here and now" are vitalized in this manner especially in the Finnish context,

in which the social security system is often referred to as a 'patchwork quilt' or a messy 'straw mobile' (FI_20.6.2017) of different targeted programs. The upshot of the safety net is that at its current state, "no one manages its big picture" (FI_206.2017). Spanish basic income proponents, too, stress the level of fragmentation and overt bureaucracy of the system and how it leads to inefficiencies and distress for the beneficiaries:

> Today the citizen does not know what rights he has got, which protection he can access in the case of problems nor which requisites are those that he has to fulfill for them and, when he does know, he is absorbed in a series of problematizations and situations that surely have made him loose a precious amount of time and above all, get burned out in the search of benefits and solutions, which is not precisely where he should be putting his energy and his effort. (ES_19.5.2005)

The underlying perception across the data is that the social security system is a product of a mismatch of different policies gradually implement one after another in search of rather short-term solutions to quickly solve the gaps identified in each moment:

> A couple of comments to this basic income issue and from the perspective of an unemployed person to the situation in which we overall are now. Indeed, we have all, as parties, been responsible for [the fact] that throughout the last years and decades we have created this […] perpetual motion machine in a way […] you know that moving a bit one block causes problems elsewhere. (FI_20.9.2016)

> It is necessary to rethink the social welfare state, and a key instrument for that can be basic income […]. Today our system [...] is a total disorder of social benefits and other economic remedies which reclaim a great level of cohesion and integration […]. 33 types of benefits, every one of them with their criteria and requirements, with their systems of adjunction and monitoring, with an army – excuse me for saying it – of people who need to be dedicated not towards giving this social wellbeing but towards even controlling these benefits. (ES_2.10.2007)

In the last citation, the distress caused by the existent system to applicants is perceived to be caused by this lack of control over one's subsistence. In many instances, this was coupled with a normative objection towards the idea that it is other actors, such as the bureaucrats, that exercise control over who gets what. In general, all decision-makers striving to push forwards a social security reform would call upon gaps in the existent system, but those arguing for basic income particularly stress how improvements which do not address the problematic system as a whole would fall short from the perks of a basic income scheme. Basic income is posed as a cohesive reform for the long term, and in this sense better than its competitors.

The assumed recipients lack control over their vulnerable situations insofar the problems are successfully argued as systematic and dependent on past decision-making. In the Spanish

context, throughout the analyzed documents, these groups most often evoked are the poor, women and the 'precariat', regarded as particularly in need for assistance:

> Especially, [universal basic income] would affect in a beneficial way to women and the youth, the great victims of precarious work and therefore of family dependency (ES_2.10.2007)

> Citizen's basic income […] will always be above the poverty line and its principles will be to end with poverty, to avoid stigmatization of that part of the population which has to demonstrate its incapability to obtain resources in order to access a particular subsidy, and to increase the level of autonomy […]" (ES_20.5.2005)

Finnish politicians particularly appealed to those working in non-standard form employment, self-employment or gig jobs, but also groups such students and single parents, before the basic income experiment which narrowed discussion more towards the unemployed population. In occasions, these groups were used to evoke story lines of struggles under the current system:

> The Greens have proposed a basic income model which would replace all current minimum benefits […]. Nowadays the situation is that if one gets unemployment benefit, one may be in a situation in which it is not worth it to take upon a random, short gig job, because it can drop the person and her family outside from social benefits. And that is of course a difficult situation for example in a case in which, let's say, one is a single parent of three children, who must carry the responsibility for being able to buy porridge to the table the following week. (FI_9.5.2015)

When the parliamentarians evoke a story of a social benefit receiver type, it serves the purpose of invigorating the issue at hand, and often to emphasize with this people's struggle – therefore, the neediness – and to downplay individual control. These are types of reasonings that influence people's evaluations of the situation and the 'deservingness' of different groups (cf. Laenen, Rossetti & van Oorschot 2019). Highlighting these groups can be regarded as a manner to work around the objection based on the norm of reciprocity (Chapter 2.2.). If there are good reasons to believe that some adults in principle capable of work are unable to participate in the cooperation even if they were willing to, this can make them seem more entitled to assistance. This is the case made when appealed to general changes in the labor market (such as increase in non-standard forms of employment) which is argued to make subsistence through employment increasingly difficult above personal control over the situation. On the other hand, justifications highlight groups of adult citizens in principle capable of working but who can be perceived to have other duties deemed reasonable: students can be are expected to be able to study instead of providing for themselves full time, or parents are expected to care for their children which restricts availability to work.

Thus, when basic income proponents call upon groups identified as beneficiaries, they are often those already at least to some extend recognized as 'deserving' by existent benefits systems targeted towards families, the youth and those in poverty. Appealing to these group identifications already coded in existent benefits systems can be argued to be particularly powerful, as actors do not often consider the discursive layer of highly institutionalized practices such as those of law (Schmid 2011). While basic income would in these arguments enhance the autonomy of, say, the poor, it also reinforces the category and targets basic income to those deemed vulnerable. On the other hand, the group identities evoked are not restricted only to those conventionally granted with targeted benefits. Especially in the Finnish parliament basic income is justified as a potential interest of any given individual, as it is argued that the future is unknown and that in some point or another, anyone could in principle be in need of a basic income, when shifting from employment to studies or parental leave or when there are gaps between short-term jobs.

In both parliaments, justifications for basic income relate to fixing gaps in the safety net, but there are differences in the goals. Spanish justifications, the concrete goal related to a basic income reform relates more concretely to extending the safety net, whereas in Finnish justifications the emphasis is more on increasing its flexibility. In both parliaments, these speakers share an understanding that population's needs have and will continue to disperse due to inevitable global changes such as increasing automation and general change of work relations.

Finnish parliamentarians address this dispersion mostly in a positive tone, while in the Spanish discussion these changes were addressed more from the perspective of the threats these changes could bring about unless actions are taken. All parliamentarians argue that the vast number of rigid categorizations for distinct benefits and groups of people is the main complication of the safety net. Positive statements towards basic income in Finnish justifications is connected to the catchword of "streamlining" the system (FI_25.10.2016), although the idea of basic income as way to simplify the multitude of existent benefits programs is broadly captured in Spanish parliamentarians' justifications as well. The old system with its categorizations in Finnish justifications is perceived as outdated because of the diversification of life paths of individuals:

> […] the basic idea in basic income is precisely not [for it] to be directed to the unemployed or to some other group but to look above these categories generated by modern industrial societies, look towards a time in which we no longer have a separate, different category an "unemployed", but instead we have people whose administrative status is changing so fast that these categorizations make no sense. (FI_25.10.2016)

> Soon we will even be talking about shredded life, in which people are simultaneously in an employment relationship, as entrepreneurs, studying a new profession, on a parental leave and the next year on a rehabilitation assistance, on a part-time pension and as caregivers. No social security system can keep up with this kind of shredded life, and that is why the government's basic income experiment is so welcome. […] (FI_9.12.2015)

Basic income is argued to meet citizen's needs beyond a world of old categorizations that no longer matches with the changed reality, and basic income reform points towards a symbolic departure from static categorizations of a 'modern industrial society' towards more dynamic times. The life has shattered as if a consequence of these inevitable changes, it is argued, basic income would buffer the ups and downs along one's life cycle, and in the society at large. Spanish parliamentarians in favor of basic income emphasize this question more from the angle of the perceived human costs caused by situations of poverty and personal distress under the existent circumstances, but similarly argue that basic income would lead to greater autonomy and alleviate these vulnerable situations.

In sum, the bases for justifying basic income within the safety net discourse are in pointing towards systemic failures such as gaps, complicatedness, rigid categorizations, and the safety net as a result of layered policy decisions in the past. The social security system needs to change, it is argued, because the social environment and future landscapes have become more disperse. As such, basic income is perceived to ensure citizen's capabilities in their different points in life (Finland), and to combat poverty and to increase autonomy (Spain). Parliamentarians across the data tend to downplay the control of benefit receivers and take as a self-evident assumption that all members of the society should be granted with means for managing through economic distress. In positive statements towards basic income, fixing the old safety net and providing subsistence and allowing for degree of autonomy to those in need are valued as desirable and necessary.

6.2. Encouraging Activity

Basic income as a tool for activation is a particular feature of the Finnish debates, which does not appear in Spanish parliamentarians' justifications for basic income. Within the activation discourse, humans are perceived as naturally striving to be productive. The purpose of basic income against this assumption is to abolish traps created by the 'passivating' social security system, consequently enabling people to express their active nature and life's preferences. Basic income is opposed with 'harsh' activation policies:

> Basic income enables the individual with more freedom of choice and power over one's own business. It incentivizes to work and makes adaptation to different life situations and moves between them easier for the individual. The basic income experiment starting in the beginning of next year has assumedly the task of demonstrating the value of basic income as an enabler of life paths of active persons and as a securer in the kinds of changes that may come up. Instead of control, the key position is given to positive future belief and trust in individuals. (25.10.2016)

However, basic income in Finnish discussions is overall linked to the activation discourse by arguing it would decrease incentive traps and bureaucratic traps which are seen a central problem of the social security system by virtually all members of parliament:

> […] the current social security system […] creates an obstacle for becoming employed, income [traps] and incentive traps are created. […] Although in the governmental program there is no talk about basic income, which is the Greens long-term goal, there are certain features in this item that give belief in that it would be possible to become, broadly in the Finnish society, convinced that exactly this kind of direction is right and decisive steps should be taken towards it. (FI_24.4.2007)

In Finnish debates, both basic income proponents and those challenging the idea often share a common understanding that unemployment is the most stressing problem of the society to be solved, and that the existent social security system is not making it possible but rather incentives passivity. Basic income, it is argued, would be more considerate towards different life paths. There is however the assumption that individuals will, once enabled with a greater autonomy to choose their paths, engage in productive activities. When Finnish politicians make a case for basic income within the activity discourse, they work around the reciprocity norm, arguing that individuals want to get active and be productive. Instead of external control, it is argued, basic income would be based on a "positive trust" towards the citizens for them to use their freedom responsibly. According to this line, it is systematically claimed that "basic income incentivizes work and hiring" (FI_14.12.2016), "makes work always worthwhile" (FI_8.11.2016) and people are strongly willing to work in gainful employment. Basic income then becomes discussed in relation to assumedly able-bodied unemployed adults and their willingness to work:

> Another difference between representative Lahtela and me regards how we understand the willingness of the unemployed to work. Representative Lahtela saw that the unemployed searches in all ways the possibility of not to work. Now for example according to the studies of the Academy [of Finland] people are ready to work and are precisely even ready to do work that doesn't match their education. But there has to be some benefit to that. My starting point is that people want to do work and that they truly are ready to do so." (FI_10.3.2005)

The understanding is that the current social security system creates traps which passivate the recipients, and adjusting the criteria, amount and timing of social transfers is the most effective

tool to motivate citizens towards choosing work. The change of work is placed as an active force, out of straight political deliberation, requiring renovations of the social security system and taxation. This change also requires an inquiry over the basis of financing the welfare society and forms of carrying those who need help through transforming the social security system that "should be rather an activating trampoline than a passivating security net" (FI_20.6.2017), bouncing one off from the foundational floor straight back to employment.

In principle it is argued that individuals would be able to live their lives a bit more according to their own desires and definitions good life with a basic income, but in fact the activation discourse calls individuals to subject positions defined by their desire and willingness to be productive. Justifications for basic income therefore shift focus from past to future reciprocity, while the norm of reciprocity in itself is highly expected to be complied with by individuals. The idea of progress here stressed enhancing future economic growth through granting a basic income as a form of social investment which would then return to the society as growth, but also as general wellbeing. Basic income is argued as giving "a better basis for developing oneself" (FI_20.6.2017).

There are two overlapping assumptions about the future returns of basic income within the activity discourse which change slightly over the observed time. During the first period of 2005-2007, basic income was justified more along with appeals to broaden the general conception of what is socially useful work. In this period, positive statements towards the expected effects of basic income would also consider that citizens would perhaps like to spend more time on care work or enhancing their education, rather than strictly focusing on gainful employment. Although basic income justifications did often embrace activity through a broader understanding of work, the focal point of the 2015-2017 discussions in Finland evolved more strongly around activity as labor market activation. This is largely explained by the fact that the 2015-2017 debates in Finland evolved around the basic income experiment, in which the political and scientific agenda was set up to test whether the incentives of a guaranteed basic income would change the way long-term unemployed Finns behave:

> The aim […] is to examine what kinds of effects a basic income, paid without means-testing, has on labor market behavior and participation of persons who at the starting situation are unemployed, receiving labor market subsidy or basic unemployment benefit (HE 215/2016)

The agenda set by the governmental bill framed the discussion towards whether basic income would be suitable in this sense of enhancing labor market activity, which guided justifications towards the activity dimension in general and more particularly towards the effects on

employment against other types of productive activities. The value of basic income became framed strictly in terms of the labor market activation effects which, in turn, created a struggle over the meaning and aims of a basic income, as its possibilities had been understood in a broader manner by many basic income proponents:

> Well, why is this case [of the experiment] not about basic income? Basic income, although an abstract of a concept, [it] is not a mindless concept, it is not a concept that means completely whatever, but during the basic income discussion over the last decades, certain characteristics have become standards of it […] Concentrating the experiment to a certain administrative category is more like looking backwards than forwards, rather part of the old system than that which has been conceived as typical of a basic income in the basic income discussion. (FI_25.10.2016)

In the Finnish 2015-2017 discussions, basic income was overwhelmingly discussed as a means for activating recipients; celebrating activity and debating on whether or not basic income would increase the level of employment and, thus, secure economic growth and the future maintenance of the welfare state. Increasingly many parliamentarians in this period joined the canon of saying that basic income would 'create employment', 'make work always attractive' and signify 'positive belief in the individuals' – carrot, instead of stick, for the unemployed, it was said. The underlying assumption in these debates was also that unemployment can be addressed through provoking changes in the supply-side factors. It is noteworthy that by these most recent debates, basic income seemed to have gained a positive connotation among increasingly many MPs, despite the opposition repeatedly questioning what the government actually understood as basic income:

> Maybe the name [of a 'basic income' experiment] does not necessarily fit in place, but it nevertheless tells that there is a positive attitude taken, and it is maybe a little, I would still say, kinder to those people who are in the realm of this experiment, than if we talked about this incentive experiment or about how could we now get those long-term unemployed to that working life, because it has also been brought up how we talk about people and whether it is respectful or not. (FI_25.10.2016)

> I wish that we will get that kind of a positive vibe from this experiment to this issue now […] (FI_25.10.2016)

Changes in the environment are perceived mainly as something exterior to political decision-making. What is left for political decision-making is trying to adjust to these changes by enhancing labor market activation and flexibility. Here, the evolvement of the society is taken as a value per se: any steps are good, no matter the direction. The social security system is perceived to need 'norm dismantlement' (FI_6.9.2016).

> This basic income experiment […] is a start or a bridge towards the evolving social security of the decade of 2020, which takes into account better chopped up jobs ("silpputyö") and that today and in the future a person needs increasingly many sources of income to gather up one's overall income. (FI_25.10.2016)

The activation discourse emphasizes that individuals' actions are first and foremost motivated by economic incentives or the lack of them. If monetary incentives become the perceived as the main motivator of the level and quality of one's activity, similar effects could arguably be reached also by restricting the amount or conditions for basic allowances. The valuable activity and means of activation were understood in very different ways by different actors, as outlined here:

> Also, I cannot understand that the same government that tries out basic income, which to my mind is a positive thing, has not agreed to take into this law proposal [of the activation model] an article which would guarantee that a broader definition would be given to activity in a way, so that [in situations] when no job vacancies exist, the unemployed could guarantee the maintaining of his unemployment benefit via showing activity in other ways, for example in voluntary work or in some NGO work, which would sustain his wellbeing and participation in the society. (FI_8.12.2017)

Although the parliamentarian in the citation above indicate a seeming paradox between the governments' strict activation scheme on the one hand, and an unconditional basic income, on the discursive side these both schemes were rationalized according to same ideas about activation and that individuals primarily choose to work or not based on rational economic calculations or lack of subsistence.

In sum, the activation discourse appeals to an idea that individuals are naturally active, and they find their sense of value in actively engaging in an active lifestyle and work opportunities, particularly if incentivized through monetary rewards. Passivity is perceived as a state of affairs forced by the existent social security system, not principally the fault of the individuals. The social security system is perceived to create traps and inefficiencies, which need to be reformed towards a more flexible and work-incentivizing system. Those against basic income argued that basic income would even further disincentivize work, encourage passivity and increase the problem of free-riding of those who do cannot be trusted to embrace the ideal of active citizenship. The parliamentarians favoring basic income, on the other hand, do not question the values of activation or the principle of contribution. Instead, they stress that a guaranteed basic income would be the way to remove reinforced obstacles from the individuals' way so that they can support themselves and fulfill their lives with more meaning via employment, small entrepreneurship, freelancing, and other types of jobs.

6.3. Emancipation of popular classes

While goals such as increasing individual autonomy, dignity, right to subsistence and questions of fairness and justice feature in justifications for basic income in both parliaments, the predominant basic income discourse in Spanish debates stands in clear distinction to the dominant activity discourse in Finland. Within the emancipation discourse, the society is perceived through the imagery of a constant struggle between the powerholders and what the parliamentarians call workers or the 'popular classes'. Basic income is constructed as a citizen's right in itself, without assumptions about future productive behavior. Quite the contrary – basic income becomes a means to opt out from oppressive working conditions and to increase freedom from domination through increased material independence. Assumptions about activity are, if anything, related to the citizen's rights and tool for political participation. In the emancipation discourse, social groups are perceived primarily in relation to the capitalist production system and basic income becomes a tool for freedom in the sense of being able to say no to powerholders. Poverty and the transformation of work is understood to be caused by an increasingly unequal division of labor and capital:

> Poverty and exclusion are a natural result of the current economic system. Poverty understood as the lack of economic resources to cover basic needs has increased as a consequence of the crisis and social cuts; exclusion understood as the lack of an access to the mechanisms of human development, work and dignified housing, life-long education, health, affective ties, communal networks, political participation, is also growing in many of its dimensions, but neither poverty nor exclusion appeared with the crisis. Both came and still come from the hand of an unequal and unsustainable model of growth and hierarchical social relations, of privilege and domination, of a capitalism of pals as they say […] (ES_20.12.2016)

Poverty and exclusion are perceived as natural results of an unjust economic system, but within this discourse, these systemic changes are brought into the debate as objects of political deliberation rather than perceiving them external to it, as was the case within the activation discourse. The same speaker continues by expanding the concept of unequal power to patriarchal relations and exploitation, appealing to basic income as a tool for citizen's emancipation:

> Patriarchy, exploitation and violence are parts of the same scene, of the same story, all of them creators of loneliness, stigmas and marginalization. It is necessary to question, with facts and not only declaratively – [to which] we are very accustomed to – the heart of the predominant economic and financial relations with any necessary audacity. Citizen's basic income and policies of proximity must be situated at the heart of the public strategy. (ES_20.12.2016)

Basic income is justified through a critique of the unjust accumulation of wealth and its 'perverse' results, and as a means for fairer distribution of wealth in the society:

> We are talking about a tool which will not resolve all of the problems of our society – the most important one, to our understanding, is the accumulation of wealth in the hands of few – but yes it will permit to resolve one of its most perverse consequences, namely, to end with poverty and social exclusion. (ES_2.10.2007)

> […] we are not going to deny that what is the priority is to make an effort for socializing the wealth in favor, as we say, of the popular classes, but basically and first of all the combat against exclusion and poverty. (ES_20.12.2005)

Although it is stated that basic income will not resolve the most important problem of the society, namely the unjust accumulation of wealth to a small minority, the dynamic of capitalist production becomes problematized in the discourse. The ideal goal is, even, a society in which the production system is profoundly reshaped to redistribute wealth and political power equally to all citizens. Moreover, basic income is understood as a 'clarification' of citizen's rights and emancipation of the 'popular classes'.

> […] it can be, without doubt, an approach which is much clearer, more efficient, more just and not exactly of more economic cost, but of better redistribution and clarification of the citizen's rights". […] "what is fundamental to us is to start to work in a committee on the meaning of the basic income, which is a very important option for that it would be possible to overcome with all rotundity the helplessness of many citizens facing a clearly unjust economic system". (ES_19.5.2005)

> [Basic income] is not a small reform but [instead] it profoundly innovates to the bottom, in essence, questions, and goes beyond the normative and programmatic foundations of our social welfare state. To say it graphically, the universal suffrage in the 20th century perhaps represented something that could be similar for the democracy than what basic income could be for the 21st century for this social welfare state, namely, a truly qualitative jump in the conception of social citizenship. (ES_2.10.2007)

The emancipation discourse appeals to a Marxist perception of the world defined by a capitalist production system and talks to the popular classes as 'us' rather than appealing to national competence. Quite the contrary, the discourse is in fact in a critical relation towards the imperative of competitiveness which happens through accumulation of wealth in the hands of few. It indicates that, although from the epistemic governance perspective it may be disadvantageous to appeal to more 'unorthodox' assumptions about the social world, some politicians may use them if the political goal is wider socioeconomic transformation. Increasing the individual freedom and bargaining power of the workers in relation to the employers and women in relation to their families are goals related to basic income. The questions of bargaining

power and care work appeared only very marginally as goals in Finnish justifications, and when they did, they were not associated with the critique of the capitalist production system in this sense.

The Spanish basic income proponents discuss basic income on an ideal level, without specifying more than that an apt basic income would not be any less than at the poverty threshold. The measure is perceived as part of a continuum of historical steps towards fulfilling democratic rights and basic income is perceived as the "political concretion of republican values in which our current democracy shall aim for culminating, namely, those of liberty, equality and fraternity" (ES_2.10.2007). In addition, justifications in the Spanish parliament appeal to developments of the discussion in other countries to highlight that basic income represents the next step in modernization:

> "Do the gentlemen of Ciudadanos and of the PP [Partido Popular] remember when you said that we were anti-system for considering the horizon of this proposal? What have you thought about when your friends at Davos and in Silicon Valley consider defending it? In Finland it is already starting to be pushed towards practice and I do not think they have had to put snipers to the border as José Carlos Díaz[3] said. (Applauses). We shall see how the debate advances in the rest of the countries, but if we do not approve of it here beforehand, we will perhaps have to implement it due to a European directive. To finish, I would like to remind you that in the 19th century, education and public health care appeared utopian, and regardless of many of you, today they are reality. As Galeano[4] said, the utopia is a horizon. You take two steps and the horizon distances itself ten steps further. But, of what use is the utopia? The utopia serves to walk, so let us keep on walking. (ES_2.2.2017)

Basic income is indeed proposed even as a 'utopian' measure as opposed to a practical tweak to the existent system, but interestingly from a distinctively positive perspective. Parliamentarians from the major parties did not question citizen's rights or the right to subsistence per se, but basic income was faced with strong opposition namely because it is most often deemed utopian or wildly unrealistic in practice. Within the popular classes' emancipation discourse, basic income was understood as a basic right without any expected behavior on behalf of its receivers; the mere existence makes a citizen worthy of basic income. The link between new fundamental rights, universal basic income and the notion of citizenship take another turn when it was also connected to the context of Catalonian independence and 'creating new fundamental rights' in this sense:

> [...] everything you defend, we share [...] but not only this, also the installation of a universal basic income, funds to attack structural poverty [...]. But pay attention, our position is the

[3] a Spanish economist and a blogger
[4] A famous Uruguayan novelist

> following one. To be able to generate new fundamental rights, to our understanding a constituent process is necessary. This is our thesis. In Catalonia we have the opportunity, I don't know whether we will achieve it, to start a constituent process which would allow us to conquest new subjective rights that would not be limited to the leading principles of the Constitution but subjective rights, new fundamental rights, the reason for why we ask you for help. Because if in Catalonia we have the opportunity [...] it is evident that you pursue the same for the ensemble of the Spanish state, I am convinced that you will help us to make it possible and make it a reality [to create] this constituent process, which must culminate in the proclamation of the Republic of Catalonia. (ES_12.4.2016)

The understanding about a fundamental change of work is essentially shared with the understanding of the Finnish parliamentarians, but the tone is different. Spanish parliamentarians justify for a basic income as a remedy against the threat of continuing disadvantage suffered by the workers.

> New technologies, as you know, allow production with less work. Where has this increase in productivity went to? [...] To the high income [groups], to the big entrepreneurs. If the tendency towards the advancement of robotization [...] continues, this gap between productivity and work will not cease to increase. […] The debate on this law allows to open a pathway to debate and reflect in these General Courts over basic income. (ES_2.2.2017)

Basic income from this perspective appears as a necessity if one is to prevent greater suffering and inequalities which are, it is argued, inevitably coded into the global capitalist system. These in practical argumentation were linked to evidence on poverty rates in Spain as well as the insufficiency of current minimum income schemes in reaching the poverty threshold of those in need. Basic income is linked to the goal of increasing bargaining power and democratic participation of the working class and those living in poverty. This echoes Spanish justifications in which basic income is understood as a tool for material independence and thereon for fulling democratic citizenship (Raventós 2007; Raventós, Wark & Casassas 2012, 144).

Table 2. Summary of findings

	Basic Income Discorse
Objects of Epistemic Work	**Fixing the Safety Net**
Environment	Securing basic needs efficiently, modernizing the social security system as goals Problems of social security system as a result of previous, short-term focused decision-making and 'quick-fixes'. Basic income as a holistic, long-term oriented solution. Work as increasingly insecure source of income; transition from 'traditional' full-employment society to a new era mismatched with old benefits receiver categorizations Complicated, rigid, gapped benefit system. • Extending coverage (Spain) • Flexibilization (Finland)
Actors and identifications	Benefit receivers lacking control over the systemic complications resulting in their vulnerable positions • The poor, those in precarious work, women (Spain) • The unemployed, those in non-standard or 'gig jobs', entrepreneurs, students (Finland) • Diversification: of demographic groups (Spain); of individual life trajectories (Finland).
Values and norms	Combatting poverty and exclusion, providing for economic basic needs, enhancing societal sense of security as moral duties • Autonomy, humanity (decreasing suffering, enhancing well-being)
	Encouraging Activity (Finland)
Environment	Activating society and constant adaptability as goals Chronic unemployment as a challenge for economic growth and welfare state sustainability in future. Current benefits system enforces inactivity; Basic income enables people's active capacities to be released

Actors and identifications	Individuals and the nation as naturally striving towards activity; • The unemployed, small entrepreneurs and freelancers
Values and norms	active citizenship, growth, adaptability
	Emancipation (Spain)
Environment	Enhancing democratic rights and bargaining power of working class through economic independence as goals World characterized by the capitalist production system, patriarchy and exploitation Economic system naturally leading to accumulation of wealth to the hands of a small minority; enhancing automation and lack of collective bargaining will polarize inequalities and hardships faced by workers.
Actors and identifications	Relation between powerholders and the dominated as constant struggle • Workers, women, the poor, capitalists; Catalonia
Values and norms	Justice, democracy, freedom from domination

7. Discussion

This study has analyzed parliamentary debates on universal basic income in Finnish and Spanish national parliaments' plenary sittings. The study has adopted the perspectives of domestication global models and epistemic governance for basic income field battles. The aim was to understand how the purpose of basic income is understood in the parliamentary debates and to what extend justifications for basic income share similarities across the case parliaments. Additionally, the analysis also led to finding important variation specific to each case parliament.

Justifications for basic income evolved in both countries' parliaments around the goal of fixing perceived problems in the existent social security safety net. Additionally, in Spain the main purpose of basic income was increasing the workers' bargaining power and individuals' autonomy, while in Finnish justifications the predominant purpose related to increasing activity

and labor market participation. The most dominant perception of the current circumstances in basic income justifications was that the labor markets have drastically changed and, hence, the social security system needs to be updated to current citizens' needs. It was also expected that persisting long-term unemployment rates and the basic income related experiments in the two countries would appear in the parliamentary debates. The Finnish experiment was mentioned in the Spanish discussions, but the local experiment in Barcelona was not linked to basic income justifications in neither one of the parliaments. In both case contexts, the justifications for basic income did rely strongly on work and labor market effects, but in very different ways.

From Spain, the data covered the pioneering debates of basic income in the national parliament which took place in 2005, whereas these debates on basic income in the Finnish parliament date back to 1980s and were not covered in the selected data. In Spanish parliamentary justifications, there was no evident change in basic income discourse over the observed periods of 2005–2007 and 2015-2017. In the Finnish debates there was a minor change between 2005–2007 and 2015–2017, in that the latter discussion emphasized basic income more as a tool for labor market activation rather than broader activities. Nevertheless, the activity discourse was the predominant one in the debates. These findings were in line with Johanna Perkiö's (2018) previous work on the Finnish case, while similar analysis prior to this study had not been done on the Spanish case. It is possible to interpret the difference of basic income discourse between the case countries in the light of domestication and newness of basic income in those local contexts. The debates on basic income in Finland have existed for four decades and in Spain for the last two decades. This may explain why Finnish parliamentarians made virtually no references to national or international basic income thinkers, whereas their Spanish colleagues explicitly mentioned basic income thinkers such as Philippe Van Parijs and Daniel Raventós, the University of Louvain as the birth place of basic income, and the Basic Income Earth Network as influencers in the basic income discussion.

In Finnish parliamentary debates the purpose of basic income was integrated to a mainstream discourse and to commonly shared goals such as securing economic growth and increasing labor market participation. On the other hand, it also narrowed down understandings of basic income, connecting it with the logic of incentivizing. In this discourse people's behaviors can be primarily affected through monetary incentives, either by restricting them or increasing them. The claims are related to the stiffness of the social security system and incentive traps, which should be adapted to the needs of the labor market. In Spain, the purpose of basic income was predominantly articulated as a new citizen's right and a tool for emancipation for those in

vulnerable positions. Basic income was appealed to as part of a historical continuum of citizen's rights such as equal vote. The underlying understanding was that basic income provides fairer distribution of wealth among members of the society. Basic income here is a tool for enhancing economic independence which in turn is perceived as a necessary precondition for fulfilling democratic rights.

The two country-specific discourses portray different perspectives to basic income. Within the emancipation discourse, basic income becomes a goal in its own, as it is perceived as a basic citizen's right. This discourse could in principle resonate well in the context of the Spanish social assistance system, in which there is no final resort benefit for working-aged adults of unlimited duration except for few autonomous regions. On the other hand, in the concrete debates the overarching goal of emancipation was either prioritized as secondary or irrelevant by most parliamentarians. In Finnish parliamentary debates, basic income has been brought into an overall prevalent activation discourse, which could make the proposal approachable to many politicians. However, here the successfulness of basic income is conditioned on the positive behavioral effects it would allegedly cause. Linking basic income to rather modest goals of increasing activity rather than emancipating individuals is can be interpreted against the context of somewhat generous existing last resort benefits for the working-age population in Finland, although these are not unconditional like basic income.

The process of analysis revealed that there was a wide consensus among parliamentarians over the need for fixing the safety net. The activity discourse was also a predominant one in Spain, but not in justifications for basic income. The emancipation discourse, on the other hand, was clearly shared only among those in favor of basic income in Spain. Normative resistance towards basic income was predominantly related to reciprocity, particularly granting 'free money' to working-aged citizens. Echoing Birnbaum (2019), basic income was challenged related to questions of need and target-efficiency, namely arguing that other more efficient measures could tackle the same issues. It was also consistently argued that basic income could have intended or unintended perverse consequences, such as furthering unemployment and social exclusion instead of tackling these.

Justifications for basic income in the Spanish parliament came from members of minoritarian Leftist and Green parties, almost exclusively Catalonian regional parties, whereas in Finland parties from more diverse ideological backgrounds participated in justifying basic income. The analysis in the section 6.3. also shows that basic income was also connected with creating new fundamental rights in the Catalonian region, and thus basic income could be seen having

symbolic value within the larger context of creating new meanings for social citizenship and autonomy within the Spanish kingdom. The epistemic governance perspective and domestication studies suggest that politicians tend to appeal to the common good of the nation-state, i.e. national competence and well-being, this holds true only partially in Spanish plenary session justifications for basic income. The assumed audience of the work of convincing in this case may not be other Spanish parliamentarians or the Spanish people as a whole, but rather, the local Catalan audience.

On the other hand, it can be questioned whether it is indeed reasonable to assume that plenary sessions open a window to widely shared assumptions held in the society at large, as argued from the epistemic governance perspective. It seems plausible that politicians that strive to articulate narrow stakeholder interests as those of the whole nation to convince the public and themselves about what are realistic and desirable courses of action, leading to vague appeals for 'offering more opportunities' or 'enhancing social inclusion'. Yet, one may also question how the general public here should understood: who listens to the plenary sessions or searches the diaries on the internet to read them through? Most likely not many of those in very vulnerable positions, those struggling with long-term poverty or exclusion – indeed many of the intended target groups of the social benefits system. The case of Spanish justifications for basic income challenges the assumption from another angle: even in a national parliament, the assumed audience of some speeches may well be a regional one. To this regard it seems that Alasuutari's (2016, 6) suggestion that national interest is the "only morally impeccable one" in the national parliaments' political discourse does not hold, at least if national interest is equated with nation-state.

The choices made regarding the data and methodology in this study set some considerable limitations for interpreting the results. It should be bared in mind that plenary session recordings only represent but a tiny fraction of basic income related debates and developments in the case countries. In Spain, particularly, basic income virtually disappeared from parliamentary debates during the hardest years of the economic recession, but it simultaneously gained more interest among civil society actors. The other consideration relates to the data points: although the data included six years from both countries between 2005 and 2017, there are considerably more data points from the Finnish parliament than from the Spanish one. The main reason behind this is the expansion of mentions during the preparations of the basic income experiment.

Finnish and Spanish parliamentary debates have provided an interesting example of domesticating basic income into the discussion on fixing the social security net and into the

predominant activation discourse (Finland), or, by contrast, linking basic income to the historical development of citizen's rights and freedom (Spain). At present, basic income remains an unorthodox proposal in both case countries, although basic income related experiments have taken place in the most recent years. Even if politicians can state that they are in favor of shared values, ideals and definitions of the environment appealed to in justifications favoring basic income, there are many reasons for why they would not support the basic income proposal per se. In the case of Finland, for example, the coalition government that decided on a basic income experiment also implemented a strict activation model in 2018, which aimed for the same purpose – enhancing unemployed people's activity – albeit through negative incentivization.

Up until the recent decade, basic income has been a relatively unknown proposal for the public. Now there has been a clear expansion in policy attention and more basic income initiatives than ever taking place around the globe, from crowdfunded projects to public authorities who are trying out different basic income type schemes. Similarly, more empirical research than ever is now underway evaluating basic income in its various forms and in relation to local institutional and political dynamics. Basic income has been moving from a somewhat abstract ideal form discussion to concrete parliamentary debates, in which the purpose and prospects of basic income are questioned and refined. Moving onwards, it will be interesting to follow in what ways the expanding body of basic income research and the experiences from basic income experiments will be utilized in domesticating the proposal. At the same time, general discussions about the politics of basic income in the future can benefit from case studies that empirically examine what have been the main discourses related to basic income in different countries, as these may depict very different ways of perceiving the proposal.

Annex: Data

Year	Country	Name	Mentions
2005	Spain	ES_14.4.2005 *Mesa del Congreso*	**8**
		ES_20.5.2005 *Mesa del Congreso*	**8**
		ES_11.5.2005	**3**
		ES_19.5.2005	**5**
		ES_20.12.2005	**2**
			Total 26
	Finland	FI_2.3.2005	**1**
		FI_9.3.2005	**7**
		FI_10.2.2005	**1**
		FI_10.3.2005	**6**
		FI_20.10.2005	**4**
		FI_29.9.2005	**3**
			Total 22
2006	Spain	ES_14.2.2006	**1**
		ES_23.5.2006	**1**
			Total 2
	Finland	FI_13.12.2006	**1**
		FI_18.12.2006	**8**
		FI_20.12.2006	**1**
		FI_26.10.2006	**4**
		FI_29.11.2006	**1**
			Total 13
2007	Spain	ES_2.10.2007	**71**
			Total 71
	Finland	FI_18.4.2007	**1**
		FI_19.9.2007	**1**
		FI_19.12.2007	**1**
		FI_20.9.2007	**1**
		FI_24.4.2007	**2**

		FI_25.4.2007	**11**
		FI_26.4.2007	**7**
			Total 24
2015		FI_1.10.2015	**13**
		FI_2.6.2015	**9**
		FI_3.6.2015	**9**
		FI_3.11.2015	**1**
		FI_6.10.2015	**5**
		FI_7.10.2015	**14**
		FI_9.10.2015	**39**
		FI_9.12.2015	**15**
		FI_13.3.2015	**1**
		FI_14.12.2015	**3**
		FI_ 15.9.2015	**1**
		FI_ 15.10.2015	**5**
		FI_ 15.12.2015	**1**
		FI_ 16.6.2015	**1**
		FI_16.12.2015	**8**
		FI_ 18.11.2015	**2**
		FI_24.6.2015	**2**
		FI_24.11.2015	**3**
		FI_25.2.2015	**1**
		FI_ 25.11.2015	**5**
		FI_29.9.2015	**9**
		FI_ 30.9.2015	**2**
			Total 149
2016	Spain	ES_12.4.2016	**1**
		ES_20.12.2016	**1**
			Total 2
	Finland	FI_1.3.2016	**1**
		FI_1.12.2016	**2**
		FI_4.10.2016	**5**
		FI_5.10.2016	**1**

		FI_6.4.2016	**2**
		FI_6.9.2016	**38**
		FI_8.11.2016	**10**
		FI_8.12.2016	**4**
		FI_9.2.2016	**4**
		FI_9.11.2016	**13**
		FI_12.12.2016	**3**
		FI_14.4.2016	**13**
		FI_14.10.2016	**30**
		FI_14.12.2016	**7**
		FI_16.12.2016	**64**
		FI_18.2.2016	**10**
		FI_18.5.2016	**3**
		FI_19.4.2016	**8**
		FI_19.12.2016	**1**
		FI_20.9.2016	**16**
		FI_20.12.2016	**9**
		FI_21.6.2016	**8**
		FI_21.9.2016	**16**
		FI_22.6.2016	**10**
		FI_23.9.2016	**12**
		FI_24.2.2016	**1**
		FI_25.10.2016	**246**
		FI_27.9.2016	**1**
		FI_29.9.2016	**1**
		FI_31.3.2016	**12**
			Total 551
2017	Spain	ES_2.2.2017	**20**
		ES_4.55.2017	**1**
		ES_14.6.2017	**1**
		ES_28.9.2017	**1**
		ES_29.11.2017	**1**
			Total 24

	Finland	FI_4.5.2017	**3**
		FI_4.10.2017	**1**
		FI_4.12.2017	**2**
		FI_7.12.2017	**5**
		FI_8.12.2017	**3**
		FI_11.12.2017	**8**
		FI_13.12.2017	**1**
		FI_14.2.2017	**1**
		FI_15.2.2017	**3**
		FI_16.11.2017	**2**
		FI_17.1.2017	**1**
		FI_20.6.2017	**15**
		FI_20.9.2017	**1**
		FI_21.6.2017	**28**
		FI_23.11.2017	**1**
		FI_27.9.2017	**2**
		FI_30.5.2017	**1**
			Total 78

List of References

Alasuutari, P. 2014. "Interdependent Decision-Making in Practice: Justification of New Legislation in Six Countries." In *National Policy-Making: Domestication of Global Trends*, edited by Pertti Alasuutari, and Ali Qadir, 25–43. London: Routledge.

Alasuutari, P. 2015. *The Synchronization of National policies. Ethnography of the Global Tribes of Moderns*. London: Routledge.

Alasuutari, P., and Rasimus, A. 2009. "Use of the OECD in justifying policy reforms: the case of Finland." *Journal of Power* 2(1): 89–109. doi: 10.1080/17540290902760899

Alasuutari, P., and Qadir, A. 2016. "Imageries of the social world in epistemic governance." *International Sociology* 31(6): 633–652.

Alasuutari, P., and Qadir, A. 2014a. "Epistemic governance: An approach to the politics of policy-making." *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology* 1(1): 67–84.

Alasuutari, P., and Qadir, A. 2014b. "Introduction." In *National Policy-Making: Domestication of Global Trends*, edited by Pertti Alasuutari and Ali Qadir, 1–22. London: Routledge.

Andersson, J. O. 2000. "The History of an Idea: Why Did Basic Income Thrill the Finns, but not the Swedes?" In *Basic Income on the Agenda. Policy Objectives and Political Chances*, edited by Loek Groot and Robert van der Veen, 224–237. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Andersson, J. O., and Kangas, O. 2002. "Perustulon kannatus Suomessa." *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka* 67(4): 293–307.

Basic Income Earth Network BIEN. 2019a. About Basic Income. http://basicincome.org/basic-income/ Accessed January 25th, 2019.

Basic Income Earth Network BIEN. 2019b. National & Regional Affiliates. http://basicincome.org/about-bien/affiliates Accessed January 25th, 2019.

Birnbaum, S. 2019. "The Ethics of Basic Income." In *The Palgrave International Handbook of Basic Income*, edited by Malcolm Torry, 507–522. Palgrave Macmillan (eBook). doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-23614-4

Bowles, S., and Gintis, H. 1998. "Is Equality Passé? Homo Reciprocans and the Future of Egalitarian Politics." Technical Report, Department of Economics. Amherst, University of Massachusetts.

Burr, V. 2003. *Social Constructionism* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Campbell, J. 1998. "Institutional Analysis and the Role of Ideas in Political Economy." *Theory and Society* 27(3): 377–409.

Chrisp, J. 2017. "Basic Income: Beyond Left and Right?" *Juncture* 23(4): 266–270.

Chrisp, J. and Martinelli, L. 2019. "Neither Left Nor Right." In *The Palgrave International Handbook of Basic Income*, edited by Malcolm Torry, 477–492. Palgrave Macmillan (eBook). doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-23614-4

Casassas, D., and De Wispelaere, J. 2011. "Renta básica y emancipación social: principios, diseños y coaliciones." In *La Renta Básica en la era de las grandes desigualdades*, edited by David Casassas and Daniel Raventós, 105–136. Barcelona: Montesinos.

Clua-Losada, M. 2011. "La renta básica en la agenda política: la experiencia catalana (2001-2006)." In *La Renta Básica en la era de las grandes desigualdades*, edited by David Casassas and Daniel Raventós, 168–189. Barcelona: Montesinos.

Dean, M. 1998. "Administering Asceticism: Reworking the Unemployed Citizen." In *Governing Australia: Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government*, edited by Mitchell Dean and Barry Hindess, 87–110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Wispelaere, J. 2016. "The Struggle for Strategy: On the Politics of the Basic Income Proposal. *Politics* 36(2): 131–141. doi: 10.1111/1467-9256.12102

De Wispelaere, J. 2015. *An Income of One's Own? The Political Analysis of Universal Basic Income*. PhD diss. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

De Wispelaere, J., Halmetoja, A., and Pulkka, V-V. 2019. "The Finnish Basic Income Experiment: A Primer." In *The Palgrave International Handbook of Basic Income*, edited by Malcolm Torry, 389–406. Palgrave Macmillan (eBook). doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-23614-4

De. Wispelaere, J. and Stirton, L. 2012. "A Disarmingly Simple Idea? Practical Bottlenecks in the Implementation of a Universal Basic Income." *International Social Security Review*, 65(2): 103–121.

De Wispelaere, J., and Noguera, J. A. .2012. "On the Political Feasibility of Universal Basic Income: An Analytic Framework". In *Basic Income Guarantee and Politics*, edited by Richard Caputo, 17–38. Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9781137045300_2

Esping-Andersen, G. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, I., and Fairclough, N. 2012. *Political Discourse analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.

Frazer, H., and Marlier, E. 2016. "Minimum Income Schemes in Europe: A Study of National Policies." European Social Policy Network (ESPN). doi: 10.2767/860513.

Groot, L., and van der Veen, R. 2000. "How Attractive is a Basic Income for European Welfare States?" In *Basic Income on the Agenda. Policy Objectives and Political Chances*, edited by Loek Groot and Robert van der Veen, 13–38. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Gofas, A., and Hay, C. (eds.). 2012. *The Role of Ideas in Political Analysis: A Portrait of Contemporary Debates*. London and New York: Routledge.

Haagh, L. 2019. "The Philosophy and Political Economy of Basic Income Revisited". In *The Palgrave International Handbook of Basic Income*, edited by Malcolm Torry, 253–299. Palgrave Macmillan (eBook). doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-23614-4

Halmetoja, A., De Wispelaere, J. and Perkiö, J. 2018. "A Policy Comet in Moominland? Basic Income in the Finnish Welfare State." *Social Policy and Society*, first published online. doi:10.1017/S1474746418000258.

Torfing, J. 2005. "Discourse Theory: Achievements, Arguments and Challenges." In *Discourse Theory in European Politics. Identity, Policy and Governance*, edited by David Howarth and Jacob Torfing, 1–32. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Ikkala, M. 2012. "Finland: Institutional Resistance of the Welfare State against a Basic Income." In *Basic Income Guarantee and Politics. International Experiences and Perspectives on the Viability of Income Guarantee*, edited by Richard K. Caputo, 63–82. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Julkunen, R. 2009. "Perustulo – kuinka sama idea toistuvasti kohtaa sosiaalidemokraattisen hyvinvointivaltion." In *Ajatuksen voima. Ideat hyvinvointivaltion uudistamisessa*, edited by Johannes Kananen and Juho Saari, 261–295. Helsinki: Minerva.

Jokinen, A., Juhila, K. and Suoninen, E. 1993. *Diskurssianalyysin aakkoset.* Tampere: Vastapaino.

Kettunen, P. 2008. *Globalisaatio ja kansallinen me. Kansallisen katseen historiallinen kritiikki*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Koistinen, P., and Perkiö, J. 2014. "Good and Bad Times of Social Innovations: The Case of Universal Basic Income in Finland." *Basic Income Studies* 9(1): 25–57.

Laenen, T., Rossetti, F., and van Oorschot, W. 2019. "Why Deservingness Theory Needs Qualitative Research: Comparing Focus Group Discussions on Social Welfare in Three Welfare Regimes." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 60(3): 190–216. doi: 10.1177/0020715219837745

Meyer, J. W. 2004. "The Nation as Babbitt: How Countries Conform." *Contexts* 3(3): 42–47.

Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M., and Ramirez, F. O. 1997. "World Society and the Nation-State." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(1): 144–181.

Murray, C. 2008. "Guaranteed Income as a Replacement for the Welfare." Oxford: The Foundation for Law, Justice and Society. Accessed November 5th, 2019. http://www.fljs.org/files/publications/Murray.pdf

Noguera, J. 2018. "The Political Debate on Basic Income and Welfare Reform in Spain." *Social Policy and Society*, first published online. doi: 10.1017/S1474746418000271

Pérez, C. 2015. *Renta Básica Universal: La peor de las soluciones (a excepción de todas las demás*). Madrid: Clave Intelectual.

Perkiö, J. 2013. "Basic Income Proposals in Finland, Germany and Spain." In *Transform! European Network for Alternative Thinking and Political Dialogue*. Accessed May 5th 2019. https://www.transform-network.net/fileadmin/_migrated/news_uploads/paper__2_13.pdf

Perkiö, J. 2016. "Suomalainen perustulokeskustelu ja mallit." *Kelan työpapereita* 85/2016. Helsinki: Kela.

Perkiö, J. 2019. "From Rights to Activation: The Evolution of the Idea of Basic Income in the Finnish Political Debate, 1980–2016." *Journal of Social Policy*, first published online. doi: 10.1017/S0047279418000867

Perkiö, J., Rincón, L., and van Draanen, J. 2019. "Framing Basic Income: Comparing Media Framing of Basic Income in Canada, Finland and Spain." In *The Palgrave International Handbook of Basic Income*, edited by Malcolm Torry, 233–252. Palgrave Macmillan (eBook). doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-23614-4

Pulkka, V-V. 2018. "Finland Shares Unconditional Money, but the Public View Remains Polarised. The IPR Blog. Accessed November 24th 2019. http://blogs.bath.ac.uk/iprblog/2018/01/23/finland-shares-unconditional-money-but-the-public-view-remains-polarised/

Raventós, D., Wark, J., and Casassas, D. 2012. "Kingdom of Spain: Basic Income from Social Movements to Parliament and Back Again." In *Basic Income Guarantee and Politics. International Experiences and Perspectives on the Viability of Income Guarantee*, edited by Richard K. Caputo, 135–149. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Raventós, D. 2007. *Basic Income: The Material Conditions of Freedom*. London: Pluto Press.

Rautalin, M. 2018. "PISA and the Criticism of Finnish Education: Justifications Used in the National Media Debate." *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(10): 1778-1791. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2018.1526773

Remes, L. 2006. "Diskurssianalyysin perusteet." In *Laadullisen tutkimuksen käsikirja*, edited by Jari Metsämuuronen, 288–373. Jyväskylä: Gummerus Kirjapaino.

Saari, J., and Kananen, J. 2009. "Sosiaalipolitiikan ideat." In *Ajattelun voima. Ideat hyvinvointivaltion uudistamisessa*, edited by Juho Saari and Johannes Kananen, 13–28. Helsinki: Minerva.

Sanzo González, L. 2011. "Renta básica y protección social en España." In *La Renta Básica en la era de las grandes desigualdades*, edited by David Casassas and Daniel Raventós, 289–309. Barcelona: Montesinos.

Sanzo González, L. 2018. "La política de garantía de ingresos en España." *Zerbitzuan* 65: 41–51. doi: 10.5569/1134-7147.65.04

Soininvaara, 2000. "Preface." In *Basic Income on the Agenda. Policy Objectives and Political Chances*, edited by Loek Groot and Robert van der Veen, 13–38. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Schmidt, V. A. 2010. "Analyzing Ideas and Tracing Discursive Interactions in Institutional Change: From Historical Institutionalism to Discursive Institutionalism." *CES Papers, Open Forum,* 3. Harvard Center for European Studies. Accessed October 28th, 2019. https://ces.fas.harvard.edu/publications/000035-analyzing-ideas-and-tracing-discursive-

interactions-in-institutional-change-from-historical-institutionalism-to-discursive-institutionalism

Schmidt, V. A. 2011. "Speaking of Change: Why Discourse is Key to the Dynamics of Policy Transformation." *Critical Policy Studies* 5(2): 106–126. doi: 10.1080/19460171.2011.576520

Standing, G. 2017. *Basic Income: and How We Can Make It Happen*. London: Penguin.

Steensland, B. 2008. *The Failed Welfare Revolution: America's Struggle over Guaranteed Income Policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tervonen-Gonçalves, L. 2013. *International Ideas and National Agendas of Public Health Policy. The Cases of Finland and Portugal*. PhD diss. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Tervonen- Gonçalves, L. 2012. "From Average to Best Performers – Use of Comparisons in Identity-formation." *Critical Policy Studies* 6(3): 304–323.

van Dijk, Teun A. 2004. "Text and Context of Parliamentary Debates." In *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*, edited by Paul Bailey, 339–372. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

van Oorschot, W. 2000. "Who Should Get What, and Why? On Deservingness Criteria and the Conditionality of Solidarity Among the Public." *Policy & Politics* 28(1): 33–48.

Van Parijs, P., and Vanderborght, Y. 2017. *Basic Income. A Radical Proposal for a Free Society and a Sane Economy*. Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Widerquist, K. 2019. "Three Waves of Basic Income Support". In *The Palgrave International Handbook of Basic Income*, edited by Malcolm Torry, 31–44. Palgrave Macmillan (eBook). doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-23614-4